

WARSAW UNIV, INST. of LAW AND POPYROLOGY

Journal of Juristic Popyrology

**Volume XXXVII
Special Issue 2, 2018**

Country	<u>Poland</u>	6
Subject Area and Category	<u>Arts and Humanities</u> <u>Law</u> <u>Social Sciences</u>	H Index
Publisher	<u>Uniwersytet Warszawski</u>	
Publication type	Journals	
ISSN	0075-4277	

Indexed by Thomson & Reuters Citation Index. Impact Factor 1.09

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology, vol. XXVII, ed. by **Tomasz Derda**, Ewa Wipszycka, Warsaw 1997
The Journal of Juristic Papyrology is an annual international journal published jointly by the Department of Roman and Antique Law at the Faculty of Law and Administration, the Department of Papyrology at the Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw, and Fundacja im. Rafała Taubenschlaga. The first issue of JJP appeared 1946 and in 2002 the journal launched a series of supplements. The journal prints contributions in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish. It seeks to publish articles in papyrology, epigraphy, Roman law, as well as history of Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Egypt. JJP also regularly includes review articles and bibliographic overviews. The journal has a wide international readership made up of scholars and students in papyrology, Roman law, classics, archaeology, and history.

Editorial Board

Prof. George Andreopoulos, The City University of New York, USA
Prof. Paul Brace, Rice University, USA
Prof. Terence J. Centner, The University of Georgia, USA
Dr. Raymond K. H. Chan, City University of Hong Kong, China
Prof. Joseph Yu-shek Cheng, City University of Hong Kong, China
Prof. Bruce Cronin, City College of New York, USA
Prof. Eve Darian-Smith, University of California, USA
Prof. Shahira Fahmy, The University of Arizona, USA
Dr. Daniel B. Garrie, Rutgers University, USA
Prof. Daniel E. Hall, Miami University, USA
Prof. T. Wing Lo, City University of Hong Kong, China
Prof. Brij Mohan, Louisiana State University, USA
Prof. Andrea Padovani, University of Bologna, Italy
Dr. Michael P. Polakowski, University of Arizona, USA
Prof. Susan Kathleen Sell, Australian National University, Australia
Prof. Cassia Spohn, Arizona State University, USA
Prof. Joseph Tomain, University of Cincinnati, USA
Academic Editor, Prof. Roger Bowles, University of York, UK
Prof. Won-mog Choi, Ewha Womans University, South Korea
Prof. H. F. M. W. van Rijswijk, Utrecht University, Netherlands

To expedite the review process, please format the manuscript in the following way:

Article type: One Column

Manuscript organization:

1. All manuscripts are expected to be prepared as a single PDF or MS Word document with the complete text, references, tables and figures included. Any revised manuscripts prepared for publication should be sent as a single editable Word document. LaTeX paper is also acceptable for publication, but it should be in PDF for review first.

2. Manuscripts should be written in English. Title, author(s), and affiliations should all be included on a title page as the first page of the manuscript file, followed by a 100-300 word abstract and 3-5 keywords. The order they follow is: Title, Authors, Affiliations, Abstract, Keywords, Introduction.

Figure and table requirement:

3. All figures or photographs must be submitted as jpg or tif files with distinct characters and symbols at 500 dpi (dots per inch). Test your figures by printing them from a personal computer. The online version should look relatively similar to the personal-printer copy. Tables and equations should be in an editable rather than image version. Tables must be edited with Word/Excel. Equations must be edited with Equation Editor. Figures, tables and equations should be numbered and cited as Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3, etc. in sequence.

How to count page numbers:

4. Before submission or after acceptance, type your manuscript single spaced, and make all the characters in the text, tables, figure legends, footnotes and references in a single typeface and point size as 10 pt Times New Roman. This will save space, make it easier for reviewers and editors to process the submitted work, and contributes to slowing down global warming by using less paper.

Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics)

There are 32 citations for articles published in BLR journal as of June 2017, which increase by 45% compared to 22

citations as of June 2016.

Please click the following link to see the screenshot.

There are 274 citations for articles published in journal **BLR** as of December 2017 based on the statistics from Google Scholar.

The 2-year Google-based Journal Impact Factor (2-GJIF) is 1.29.

BLR has been indexed by several world class databases. For more information, please access the following links:

- Academic Journals Database
- Academic Keys
- AiritiLibrary
- Autoritetslister for serier og forlag
- Base-Search
- Blyun
- CALIS
- ChaoXing Periodicals
- Citefactor
- CNKI SCHOLAR
- CrossRef
- DTU Findit
- EBSCO A-to-Z
- Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek(EZB)
- eReading(CNPIEC)
- GETIT@YALE(Yale University Library)
- Gold Rush
- Harvard Library E-Journals
- HeinOnline
- Infotrieve
- i-Scholar
- JournalSeek
- JournalTOCs
- National Center for Philosophy and Social Sciences Documentation
- National Science and Technology Library(NSTL)
- National Science Library, Chinese Academy of Sciences (NSLC)
- OneSearch
- Open Access Journals Search Engine(OAJSE)
- Open Access Library
- Polish Scholarly Bibliography (PBN)
- PUBDB DESY Publication Database
- QUALIS/CAPEs
- Research Bible
- SciLit
- SHERPA/RoMEO
- Social Science Research Network(SSRN)
- Standard Periodical Directory(Mediafinder)
- Stanford University Libraries
- Système Universitaire de Documentation (Sudoc)
- Technische Informationsbibliothek (TIB)
- The British Library
- trueserials.com
- Ulrich
- UNICAT
- WanFang
- Worldcat
- WRLC Catalog
- Zeitschriftendatenbank (ZDB)

ORDER ENQUIRIES: Tel: +44 (0)1226 734350 Fax: +44 (0)1226 734438

Oxbow Books, 47 Church St., Barnsley, S70 2AS

GENERAL ENQUIRIES: Tel: +44 (0)1865 241249 Fax: +44 (0)1865 794449

Oxbow Books, The Old Music Hall, 106-108 Cowley Road, OX4 1JE

© 2018 Oxbow Books. All Rights Reserved.

Warsaw University

info@journaljuristicpapyrology.org

CONTENTS

From the Editor

Yakup Urbanic pp.5

Exceptions of Field Supervisors in Kenya?

Charlene A. Van Leeuwen Depauw pp.6-24

Khojaly: Massacre or genocide (legal-political analysis)

Zaur Aliyev B. pp.25-33

New models of excellence in Higher Education

Gover M.Eyler pp.34-54

Exploring Learning of Community Study

Hartej Gill pp. 55-74

State administrative and contractual character of labor law relations of civil servants

Oruj Jamil Mammadov pp. 74-85

Insights on definitions practice and evaluation policies

Nicoleta Bateman pp. 86-104

From the Editor

*However, other aspects of his argument remain compelling. The first is that theory needs to reflect on its own role in the process of societal reproduction. Traditional theory, he observed, was a function of the industrial system because it promoted a knowledge that made available the world as a place for human manipulation according to a means-end rationality. It was “a cog in an already existent mechanism” (Horkheimer, 1982: 216). Critical Theory, by contrast, aims to produce knowledge that transcends the societal conditions that produced its periodic crises. For those of us who study genocide, this is surely a pressing imperative. Is it not true, after all, that the liberal theory of genocide highlights specific phenomena but fails to illuminate the nature of the system that produces it? And don’t we want our findings to be linked intrinsically to the establishment of a world in which genocide has been banished? The concept of theory, Horkheimer urged, needs to move world society to a new state of development. The second, compelling dimension of Critical Theory is its holistic or dialectical approach, that is, its focus on “totality”: or—to use an analogy from economic theory—general equilibrium analysis rather than partial equilibrium analysis. In this respect, the Hegelian heritage retains its usefulness. The “true is the whole,” Hegel wrote in *The Phenomenology of the Spirit*, meaning for us that the individual instances of genocide we study cannot be understood other than as dialectically mediated moments of a global system. We need to study the entire system, in other words, not just its constituent parts. Horkheimer proposed that a critical theory not proceed, therefore, like traditional theory, which focuses on specific phenomena and tries to relate concepts to reality by way of hypotheses. Instead, Critical Theory proceeds historically by showing how the capitalist system functions and unfolds over time. It is not a storehouse of concepts and categories with which to interpret the course of events, then, but an internally integrated view that constructs a complete picture of a historically evolving global society as a whole.*

Expectations of Field Supervisors in Kenya: Implications for Community

Charlene A. Van Leeuwen

School of Applied Human Sciences, Department of Community Resource Management and Extension, Kenyatta University,

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/jpapyr1i1.5439>

Abstract

Community-based learning (CBL), which provides opportunities for undergraduate students to develop disciplinary and work-related knowledge and skills, is increasingly becoming an integral component of higher education. Similar to other countries, there is a widespread belief among employers in Kenya that there is a mismatch between university programs and labour market demands. In order to enhance the employability of graduates, many departments at a Kenyan university have incorporated work-integrated experiential learning opportunities such as practicums in the educational experience for undergraduate students. The aim of this article is to describe the expectations of field supervisors in host organisations participating in a community-based human services program at a Kenyan University. Fifteen purposively sampled field supervisors participated in individual face-to-face interviews that included questions about their understanding of the department's expectations of student learning activities during practicums, knowledge of the academic preparation of students in the program and challenges associated with the supervisory role. Six field supervisors exhibited some level of understanding of the expectations of their role in working with practicum students, while nine field supervisors indicated unclear expectations of the students' practicum experience. Thematic analysis revealed key themes related to: (1) student abilities, learning goals and their contributions to the host organisations, and (2) the academic program of study and academic support available from the university faculty or staff to field supervisors. The results of our study revealed a lack of clarity around practicum expectations for most of the field supervisors interviewed and insufficient preparation of the community-based organisations to host a practicum student. Several recommendations are identified to clarify the expectations of community partner organisations and the staff providing student supervision to ensure

benefits for both students and the host organisation. Results from this study can be used to inform the development or improvement of practicum opportunities focused on producing a skilled workforce.

Keywords: *Community-based learning, practicums, expectations, higher education, supervision, work-integrated learning, Kenya*

Introduction

One of the chief responsibilities of institutions of higher learning is providing students with appropriate disciplinary knowledge, skills and experiences that prepare them to tackle the multitude of issues they will encounter when they enter the workforce. Attention to the role of universities in preparing youth for the workforce has intensified in recent years, especially in African countries where there has been exponential growth in university enrolment and concerns raised about the quality of education students are receiving (Gudo, Olel & Oanda 2011; Nyangau 2014; Odhiambo 2014; Waruru 2015). Community-based learning (CBL) experiences such as service-learning, practicums and internship opportunities for undergraduate students are increasingly becoming an integral component of African higher education (Dorasamy & Pillay 2010; Ferguson & Smith 2012). While there are many variations in how CBL is defined, there is broad consensus that this form of learning involves relevant and meaningful service activities in community settings to assist students in integrating their academic knowledge with practice in the field, providing them with opportunities to reflect critically on their learning and achieve academic, personal and civic learning objectives (Clayton, Bringle & Hatcher 2013).

Almost two decades ago, Cruz and Giles (2000) noted the paucity of research examining the concerns of community partner organisations and staff. While inroads have been made, this perspective continues to be underrepresented in the literature, with the partnership landscape in Kenya still uncharted. The aim of this study is to describe the issues faced by field supervisors of undergraduate practicum students. These field supervisors are employed by community organisations providing human services in Kenya. With a deeper understanding of the issues and concerns of field supervisors, steps can be taken to address issues and, where possible, remedy concerns.

Literature review

The Value of Community-based Learning in Higher Education

The value of CBL experiences for university undergraduate students, the university and the host organisation is well-documented in research conducted in the North American context (Astin, Sax & Avalos 1999; Kuh 2008; Peters 2014; Zlotkowski 1998). Benefits for students can be grouped into four broad categories of educational, social, civic, and vocational/professional (e.g. Astin, Sax & Avalos 1999; Batchelder & Root 1994; Cantor 1995; Giles & Eyler 1994; Steinke & Buresh 2002; Tiessen & Heron 2012).

There are also many benefits arising from this form of learning for universities. Community-based learning experiences can help improve the image of universities among professionals and the public (Mgaya & Mbekomize 2014). One of the major benefits to universities is in strengthening linkages with host organisations, which may lead to the identification of new research opportunities and funding (Paul 2009). Universities may use CBL programs to market their courses and their graduates, which may lead to sustained or improved admission of students and employability of their graduates (Cooper & Orrell n.d.). Inclusion of CBL opportunities in higher education programs is important because it contributes to the development of professional competencies that may not be fostered in traditional classroom settings. This enables academic programs to respond to and meet the emerging job market needs of their respective programs, and thus enhance employability of their graduates, since they gain practical transferable skills that employers look for (Haneef, Yusof & Amin 2006). Thus, it is not surprising that there is an increasing focus on developing and expanding CBL programs. This growth places great pressure on programs, especially those that provide experiential or work-integrated learning experiences to bridge the gap between academia and students' chosen careers (Oanda & Jowi 2012; Owuor 2007).

The participating host organisations gain access to an unpaid or partially compensated labour force who have a wealth of contemporary theoretical knowledge and are keen to apply such knowledge (Mgaya & Mbekomize 2014). Bridging the gap be-

tween academic programs and the needs of the job market can be supported through a range of well-designed CBL experiences such as practicums; however, our knowledge of what students and community organisations need in order to improve CBL experiences for all stakeholders has not kept pace (Gower & Mulvaney 2012; Teichler 2011).

Community-based Learning in a Kenyan Context

Higher education in Kenya has been undergoing rapid and dynamic change as efforts have been made to align learning programs with national development priorities stipulated in policy documents, such as Kenya Vision 2030 (Odhiambo 2014; Republic of Kenya 2007). According to the Kenya Vision 2030 Second Medium Term Plan, the government will focus on matching education and training with the demand for skills required in the workplace (Republic of Kenya 2013). Relevant objectives for universities included in this nationwide initiative relate to the need to incorporate CBL for all students in higher education to enable them to acquire necessary on-the-job training skills before graduation.

Graduates from programs, such as Family and Community Sciences and related human services disciplines, face many challenges as employees with a broad range of human services organisations and government departments strive to address contemporary social and economic problems in communities throughout the country. Community-based learning experiences are especially vital for students enrolled in these types of programs in developing countries, such as Kenya, due to huge dis-

parities in income, education and gender equity.

The power of CBL is enhanced when supported by best practices; however, evidence to enhance current practice is much less abundant in the African context than in North America. There are several examples of research studies examining community-based learning in the African context (Dorasamy & Pillay 2010; Linda, Mtshali & Engelbrecht 2013; Naidoo & Devnarain 2009; Roos et al. 2005; Thomson et al. 2011), while others have conducted comparative studies of North American and Africanised models of CBL (Hatcher & Erasmus 2008; Stanton & Erasmus 2013). Using the educational philosophies of Dewey (North America) and Nyerere (Africa) to better understand these models, Hatcher and Erasmus (2008) reported that both systems expected CBL experiences to be transformative, enabling students to understand and relate to their real-world learning experiences in ways that would generate positive change for communities. Other South African studies emphasised that students in African higher education institutions needed more CBL opportunities to become professionally confident and competent, and be able to make deeper connections between their theoretical knowledge and professional skills through their CBL activities in the community (Dorasamy & Pillay 2010; Roos et al. 2005). Studies have also noted that understanding the CBL context plays a significant role in students' engagement and learning and in students gaining meaningful and productive experience (Alexander & Khabanyane 2013; Bheekie & van Huyssteen 2015; Bringle & Hatcher 2007). Similar findings

have been observed with regard to the quality of CBL learning and longer term goals of community engagement (Linda, Mtshali & Engelbrecht 2013; Mahlomaholo & Matobako 2006; Osman & Castle 2006).

While there is a growing body of literature examining service-learning in South Africa, few studies have been conducted in Kenya. Opiyo-Newa (2012) conducted an assessment of internships and CBL programs at one university and found that students had positive attitudes towards CBL opportunities, but their writing and research skills needed improvement in order to achieve their learning outcomes. In an assessment of the Students' Community Service Program at their institution, Tumuti et al. (2013) found that two-week CBL experiences allowed students to develop a variety of skills valued by Kenyan employers, such as communication and interpersonal skills, learning and problem-solving, and self-development skills. They note the benefits of this program in countering criticism of the Kenyan educational system for alienating students from the lived realities of their communities resulting from its preoccupation with testing, training for white-collar employment and focus on globalisation at the expense of local needs. Finally, in a project related to this current study, challenges encountered by field supervisors were identified and used to inform the development of a new course to prepare students for CBL experiences (Kathuri-Ogola et al. 2015; VanLeeuwen et al. 2018). These challenges included helping Kenyan students to develop reflective practice skills, articulating CBL learning goals, preparing students for demanding situations and workplaces, facilitating stu-

dents' development in interpersonal communication, and a lack of understanding of students' field experiences. Thus, it is recognised that CBL is very desirable within the Kenyan context, and the implementation of these programs is key to their success for the various stakeholders.

Implementing Community-Based Learning in Higher Education

Integrating practicums within higher education has been typically accomplished in two ways, either through a block or a concurrent approach (Haneef, Yusof & Amin 2006; Weert 2011). In the concurrent approach, students complete a designated number of hours each week with the host organisation while completing other course requirements. In the block practicum approach, students engage in community-based learning experience without completing other course requirements. In many developing countries, institutions of higher learning opt for block practicums for their students (Johnson, Bailey & Padmore 2012). The preference for the block approach could be due to limited practicum opportunities within the vicinity of the respective universities. Many host organisations in developing countries are located in areas far from industrial hubs where most universities are located, and thus students have to compete for the few practicum opportunities available. The block approach provides an opportunity for students to participate in practicum opportunities during a set practicum period in locations that can be far away from the learning institution. Additionally, the large ratio of students per faculty member makes it easier for university administrators to

manage the block system, as compared to the concurrent one.

Expectations of CBL Stakeholders

Strong relationships and partnerships are essential to CBL because of the functional role they play in establishing CBL activities, the implication of valuing reciprocity among all participants in CBL and the fundamental role played by collaboration (Bringle & Clayton 2013). The SOFAR model helps researchers and practitioners to delineate key stakeholders, or constituents, in CBL and the dynamics of these different relationships, especially since it differentiates between staff of community organisations and residents within the community (Bringle & Clayton 2013). For example, the interactions and relationships that students have with community organisation staff, who are frequently assuming some form of supervisory role in connection with the students, are different in many ways from their relationships with community residents (Bringle & Clayton 2013). These same researchers go on to discuss theoretical frameworks that inform the nature of the various interactions between individuals and the outcomes of these interactions, according to exchange theory, and the concepts of closeness, equity and integrity. Other theoretical perspectives which have been used to inform our understanding of interactions and partnerships with community organisations include Enos and Morton's (2003) work which examines transactional and transformative relationships. Their model looks at the quality of outcomes resulting from interactions between various stakeholders

involved with CBL. They view transactional partnerships as ad hoc, instrumental relationships where deep change is not expected, and long-term relationships are not expected, whereas with transformational relationships there are expectations for growth and change as the relationship develops over time.

Studies examining community partner relationships with students and the university have found that staff supervisors in community organisations are motivated to share their time and training to support student learning and expect valuable service from students (Basinger & Bartholomew 2006; Worrall 2007). Another study focusing on community partner perspectives revealed that staff members in these roles viewed these relationships as integral to the success of CBL. These individuals were willing to voice key challenges, such as poor communication, and share recommendations with university partners to improve CBL partnerships (Sandy & Holland 2006). Other researchers discussed the importance of careful preparation and follow-through and the role of staff in community organisations as co-educators (Leiderman et al. 2002). Finally, staff in community organisations with a greater voice in the planning and implementing of CBL saw more benefits for their organisation (Miron & Moely 2006).

Information sharing between institutions of higher learning and field supervisors in the host organisations is an important process in developing community-university partnerships (Kathuri-Ogola et al. 2015). The flow of information can be affected by incongruent expectations between students and field supervisors. Mis-

matches between student expectations and the reality of their practicum experiences have been found to contribute to limited learning for the student (Olson & Montgomery 2000). This is largely because students bring a number of beliefs, attitudes and expectations about the nature of the practicum (McClam & Puckett 1991; Olson & Montgomery 2000). In addition, unclear expectations can lead to weak feedback mechanisms, a mismatch between university courses and labour market demands, reduced benefits for the host organisation and inefficient learning for the students (Klosters 2014).

There is a dearth of knowledge about expectations of practicum experiences in such disciplines as Family and Community Sciences and those related to community development from the perspective of community professionals who serve as field supervisors in host organisations (Nichols et al. 2013), and there is a particular gap in our knowledge in relation to African countries. Without evidence to support the development of local best practice, the impact of CBL may be diminished. As educators and CBL practitioners in the 21st century, we sought to contribute to current knowledge and practice by examining the expectations of field supervisors throughout the practicum experience. In particular, we were interested in exploring field supervisors' expectations of their own responsibilities and their expectations of practicum students. We were also interested in the various expectations students brought to their practicum experience and their beliefs around the future benefits of practicums. The specific aim of this article is to describe the expectations of field su-

pervisors in organizations hosting students of a human service program at a Kenyan University who are undertaking CBL.

Methods

The community-based program at the university in Nairobi focuses on preparing graduates to deliver social services to individuals, families and communities. Emphasis is on the improvement of the welfare of people through community-based programs, which requires a thorough understanding of family and community dynamics. In order to prepare students effectively for these tasks, undergraduate students undertaking this program complete a mandatory 12-week block community-based practicum at the end of their third year of study. The practicum is a structured work experience in a professional setting, during which the student applies and acquires disciplinary and work-related knowledge and skills. As such, the practicum builds upon a student's coursework in the program as well as links theory with practical application. Each student is supervised by a field supervisor, who is an employee of the host organisation and oversees the student's day-to-day work. In addition, each student is assigned a member of the university faculty who provides support and evaluates the student. The students are usually attached to community programs serving children, youth, women, men, families, or groups with special needs. Generally the focus is on professional human service at the community level.

Fifteen organisations that hosted third-year practicum students during the May–August 2013 practicum session were sampled using purposive maximum varia-

tion sampling (Patton 2015). These organisations were situated in both urban and rural locations and had male and female field supervisors. Invitations for field supervisors to participate in the research were issued through telephone calls by the research team.

One field supervisor in each organisation participated in a face-to-face interview with a member of the research team. The interview included questions about field supervisors' understanding of the department's expectations of student learning activities during the practicum, knowledge about the academic preparation of students in the program of study and challenges associated with the supervisory role. Each participant was invited to share any further suggestions they had, that the university could consider to enhance the academic preparation of students for their practicum. Ethical approval for the research was obtained prior to participant recruitment from the Research Ethics Boards at the Kenyan university and the Canadian university where the investigators were employed at the time of data collection.

Qualitative data from the interviews with field supervisors was analysed using thematic analysis. An inductive six-step thematic analysis process was used to analyse the interview transcripts (Braun & Clarke 2006). This included steps of becoming familiar with the data, identifying initial themes, compiling a list of themes and sub-themes, organising the themes and sub-themes into a coding tree, naming and defining each theme, and providing a narrative description of the content of each sub-theme and illustrating them by selecting representative quotes. NVivo10 software

was used to aid in organising the qualitative data. Since three researchers were involved in coding data, appropriate procedures to ensure consensus were used (Marshall 2011). These included collectively developing and defining the themes that emerged from the data. Then, two researchers independently coded the data, and then three researchers worked together to come to a consensus on the codes assigned to the data.

Results

A total of 15 field supervisors participated in the study. The field supervisors included six men and nine women. Fourteen of the field supervisors were drawn from non-governmental development agencies and one from a government department. The two overarching themes used to organise the data focused on those field supervisors who had clear expectations of the student practicum experience, and those who had unclear expectations of the student practicum experience.

Clear Expectations

Six field supervisors exhibited some level of understanding of the expectations of their role in working with practicum students. The main contributors to this clear understanding of supervision expectations were: explanations provided by the students about their curriculum at the university and supervisors' work-related experience. For one supervisor, this resulted from personal experience rather than through prior interaction with the institutions of higher learning.

For me I understood because of my experience and exposure... I do resource mobilization and have had international

exposure... with that experience I understood (FS13).

Another supervisor reported:

...when I told him [student] to give me the units he has covered [at university],...it gave me some ideas of what kind of support he really needs to be given... (FS10).

Unclear Expectations

Nine field supervisors indicated unclear expectations of the students' practicum experience. The two themes in which field supervisors experienced unclear expectations focused on: (1) student abilities, learning goals, and their contributions to the host organisations, and (2) the student's academic program of study and level and form of academic support by the university to supervisors.

UNCLEAR EXPECTATIONS ABOUT STUDENT ABILITIES, LEARNING GOALS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Unclear expectations about student abilities emerged as a challenge. Most of the field supervisors interviewed indicated that they did not know what students were capable of, and it often took a long period of time to identify appropriate activities to assign to the students. A lack of understanding of the students' abilities resulted in unrealistically high expectations of students by their respective field supervisors. For example, some field supervisors assumed that the students would do day-to-day work activities without structured orientation and guidance.

Basically, the challenges of supervision come during the initial stages because first of all they [students] are new, it is their

first time... and they are yet to internalize the project purpose and activities. Even after this, the first 2 to 3 weeks, they get a lot of difficulties (FS8).

Notably, some field supervisors were not clear about what the learning goals of the students were so that the organisation could provide the necessary learning experiences.

At first I did not know because I told them that I felt they [students] were in the wrong place. Because yours [program] is Community Resource Management and we have no resources that we can manage at the District alone... I felt that they will not be able to learn or fit and get the required experience. But they have managed (FS7).

In some cases, the field supervisors indicated ways in which the students were able to make contributions to the host organisation, although they did not always have an expectation that this would be an outcome of the practicum. An interesting opportunity for creativity and innovation emerged for students who were placed in an environment in which there were no clear expectations of them. This was demonstrated in the flexibility and participatory approach adopted by some host organisations – they included the students in identifying the relevant activities and program they wished to be involved with.

We allow them to come up with an idea... or a program... we become open so they can come up with the ideas (FS6).

Students were also given the opportunity to be creative in defining their own experiences due to lack of expectations.

Some students come up with a write up of what they are supposed to do... so we

come up with a timetable... so the interns program themselves (FS14).

UNCLEAR EXPECTATIONS ABOUT THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT FOR SUPERVISORS

Field supervisors provided many examples of having unclear expectations about the academic program and the level and form of academic support provided to them and their organizations.

Now if maybe you can now plan on giving us the curriculum to understand or a short timetable to show what they normally do... (FS15).

Some field supervisors did not understand the course structure and the expected format for reporting on the progress of the students. This was highlighted by one of the field supervisors:

Basically if you have trainings, it can help us know in depth, what course they are taking and what kind of activities we need to engage them in because when they come here what we do is try to fit them into our system, but also I can't tell at the end of the day if it is working towards achieving the objective of the department (FS8).

To enhance their understanding of the practicum expectations, the field supervisors proposed improvement to and standardisation of documentation provided to the host organisation.

Normally, they [students] are supposed to come with documents indicating objectives... a form where they have their objectives so that when I am with them I can be able to know what they are to achieve at the end of the practicum (FS4).

Several field supervisors indicated that they expected the provision of an orientation program.

I had no idea what was expected from the students... because they were just brought to me to supervise them (FS2).

An orientation program could contribute greatly to a long-term and successful relationship between the host organisation and the academic program.

We need to first of all start a relationship with the institution and the department so that we are able to get clear information on expectations of the department and expectations of the students... so we are able to help them achieve the department's expectations and at the end of the day, we as an organisation achieve what we want from them and also help the students achieve some of their expectations (FS8).

Further, supervisors suggested that more interaction between field supervisors and faculty members was needed before the practicum began.

You should call for a short 2 or 3 day induction for your supervisors so that when you send your students then you know they are in the right hands... because if a supervisor misinterprets the expectations then they may not be able to guide the students (FS13).

The field supervisors highlighted the importance of prior interaction with university faculty to harmonise expectations of the entire practicum placement.

When I started supervising them [students], I felt I should have met their lecturer before assigning duties to them (FS3).

In addition to more knowledge about the academic requirements and an orientation program, the field supervisors ex-

pected practicums to be coordinated to a greater extent. In some instances, there was random placement of students without matching their skills with appropriate activities within the host organisation. One field supervisor indicated:

If you know the students' area of specialization one would be able to place them in the appropriate department and allocate a relevant activity. ... but if you don't have a wider knowledge of what a student expects from the attachment you may assume and leave some things out which may be very important to the student (FS3).

In other cases, students were deployed to departments within the host organisations without clear terms of reference. In addition, the host organisations sometimes did not have adequate time to prepare to host students.

If we are informed before they come at least we can prepare a job description... Otherwise, if they just come without adequate prior notice, we will only allocate to them the most pressing job like filing which may not provide an avenue for adequate learning (FS4).

Discussion

In this section, we first highlight and discuss several key findings from our study and identify several recommendations based on our findings. This is followed by a discussion of the limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

From a holistic examination of our results, we came to the realisation that many of the relationships examined in this project align with Enos and Morton's (2003) transactional relationships since they operate within existing structures in which partners come together because each has

something that the other perceives as useful. The CBL relationships in this instance could be characterised as instrumental, with limited commitments and minimum disruption of the regular work of the organisation.

Our findings indicated that there were reciprocal benefits for the students and the organisations, such as students utilising their knowledge to contribute to program development in the organisations. It is important that organisations hosting CBL students understand that benefits to the organisations can result when students are given the opportunity to apply their theoretical knowledge (Mgaya & Mbekomize 2014), in addition to students gaining important applied professional experience (Astin, Sax & Avalos 1999; Giles & Eyler 1994).

One challenge identified that could limit the benefit of the CBL experience was that the field supervisors often had very little or no prior notification that they would be supervising a practicum student, resulting in a lack of adequate preparation to host the student. In addition, limited resources meant that many host organisations did not have orientation programs or a supportive infrastructure for student practicum activities. Faced with these situations, the field supervisors assigned tasks and duties randomly with little or no regard to the students' ability or learning goals. Such mismatched activities would certainly contribute to restricted learning (Olson & Montgomery 2000). However, an interesting finding was that, in some cases, this lack of planned activities for students on practicum enhanced creativity and innovativeness. This is an example of the re-

silience of some students who have the ability to both gain important knowledge and skills and contribute to the host organisation even when little or no planning or preparation has been made for their practicum experience within the host organisation. This experience during CBL can contribute to students gaining transformative real-world learning experiences (Hatcher & Erasmus 2008), especially in a country such as Kenya in which organisations have few resources to devote to planning or preparation for student learning experiences.

A key finding of this study is that we identified a lack of clarity around practicum expectations for most of the field supervisors interviewed. This was attributed to insufficient communication between the university and the host organisation and, at times, within the host organisation itself. This is a salient finding as poor communication can hinder collaborative relationships between practicum host organisations and universities (Bringle & Clayton 2013; Kathuri-Ogola et al. 2015; Sandy & Holland 2006). The field supervisors observed that there were weak or no formal structured linkages between their organisations and the university. This made it difficult for them to understand the student's learning goals, which resulted in wasting valuable time for practicum learning. This was made worse by poor orientation within the host organisation and between the host organisation and the university. These findings are particularly problematic if universities want to develop and maintain positive relationships with organisations and improve their image in the community (Mgaya & Mbekomize 2014). Other re-

searchers have found that universities are perceived as taking resources from organisations, resulting in few benefits to the community (Nichols et al. 2013). It is clear that greater effort by universities is needed to develop stronger linkages with community organisations to ensure the sustainability and long-term success of these partnerships (Janke 2013). It is also clear that greater effort needs to be made to communicate and clarify expectations for field supervisors. Providing opportunities for field supervisors to be involved in both planning and implementing CBL could greatly contribute to improving clarity of practicum expectations and to greater engagement and benefits for the organisations (Miron & Moely 2006).

The community-based program included in this study is a relatively new program of study in Kenya and many field supervisors were not familiar with its content and structure. This resulted in the field supervisors having inconsistent expectations of the students' abilities. As a result, there were delays in assigning tasks and identifying opportunities that would contribute to students' learning objectives. This lack of awareness is understandable since, in Kenya, the human resource structure of most organisations is designed along the lines of traditional disciplines such as sociology, psychology, social work, political science, and development studies. However, the multifaceted nature of contemporary social problems requires both traditional and emerging disciplines to work towards systematic and sustainable solutions. Thus, in developing countries, such as Kenya, this means working towards ensuring that aca-

demic disciplines prepare graduates for the workplace (Republic of Kenya 2013).

The field supervisors had little or no understanding of the course structure and the centrality of the practicum in the fulfilment of its objectives. This led to delays in submission of the essential reporting materials and gaps in some key areas of student assessment. It was not surprising that some supervisors mentioned that the reporting format was both unclear and tedious. This was perhaps exacerbated by their viewing the task as additional to their normal workload yet not attracting commensurate compensation. The capacity of university faculty and staff to understand the perspective of the community partner has been identified as one of the top determinants of an effective relationship (Sandy & Holland 2006), so work is needed to address field supervisors' concerns associated with these administrative and assessment tasks.

Our results indicate that benefits could result from incorporating a pre-practicum experience in the curriculum. Enhanced preparation for the practicum experience could positively impact students' learning experience during practicum, thereby supporting national and United Nations efforts to promote quality education as leading to employment in developing countries, including Kenya (Republic of Kenya 2007). From our research in Kenya, we suggest that the following should be incorporated in the program in preparation for the practicum experience: support for the development of reflective practice; articulation of practicum expectations; mental preparation for demanding situations; and enhanced interpersonal communication skills (VanLeeuwen et al. 2018). This pre-

practicum preparation could take a number of forms, such as integration of brief CBL experiences into coursework prior to the practicum experience. For example, students could be required to complete volunteer work as part of the requirements of the program. This would create continuity in the learning process and exposure to community-based projects. Alternatively, it could be achieved through a series of guest speakers from relevant institutions or organisations serving various populations, or talks by members of the community. This could create partnership opportunities with host organisations and contribute to the role of staff in community organisations as co-educators (Leiderman et al. 2002).

Based on our findings, the practicum experience could be enhanced in five ways. (1) Holding structured and regular faculty-field supervisor consultative meetings could help to harmonise everyone's expectations of the practicum experience and the role that field supervisors have in the development of a learning contract. (2) Organising a tripartite orientation program, including students, field supervisors and faculty, to identify the opportunities, challenges and potential solutions to the challenges. This would entail involvement of the stakeholders in the development of orientation materials, which could be made available on the departmental website to reduce the cost of printing and updating material as knowledge evolves or the program curriculum changes. (3) Using standardised documentation to record challenges and report successes that address concerns raised by community partners. (4) Developing long-term reciprocal partnerships between the university and host or-

ganisations. This would help to ensure that students gain required practical experience and further develop new skills that could lead to transformational learning and students being adequately prepared to work in a changing social, economic and political landscape. This form of arrangement would allow the host organisations to plan ahead for the arrival of students, and ensure that they receive adequate supervisory direction and support as well as access to the necessary physical and financial resources to follow through on their learning activities. In addition, this would allow community organisations to allocate time for student mentoring as part of the supervisors' workload, while making sure that essential work tasks were completed. (5) Supporting greater interaction between students, faculty and field supervisors in the development of student learning contracts. This would ensure that the student's goals and objectives for their practicum experience correspond with those of the host organisation's program and the designated field supervisor.

We identified several limitations of this study. The study was limited to one academic program of one university in Kenya, and the results may not be applicable to diverse academic programs in other countries. The department was relatively new, established seven years prior to the study in a non-traditional discipline. Results from a more established academic program may yield different results. Also, the responses were limited to the views of one field supervisor per organisation even in cases where the students had more than one point of supervision. The views of field supervisors willing to participate in this

study may differ from those of other field supervisors.

The results of this study led to our identifying several topics for future research. It would be useful to conduct a more detailed examination of the role of the field supervisor in facilitating the development of students' professional knowledge and skill. Research that focuses on what field supervisors expect and how to effectively communicate this to students prior to the practicum would also be beneficial. Further exploration of the effectiveness of learning contracts in communicating student learning expectations to their field supervisor would be useful in the further development of community-based practicums, as well as research on the role of student reflections during and after the practicum. This could help to clarify their prior expectations and their learning during the practicum, with regard to professional commitment and the development of professional identity as a new human services professional.

Conclusions

This study increases the knowledge base of CBL in the form of practicums in the Kenyan context. CBL is one way that higher education in Kenya can enhance the em-

ployability of graduates from Kenyan university programs and respond to and meet emerging labour market needs. Evidence from this study to support the development of best practices responsive to a local context fills a critical gap and encourages key stakeholders in their efforts to move forward with innovative approaches to identified challenges. Based on this study, it is clear that further efforts need to be made to ensure that field supervisors who are staff in community organisations that host students for CBL experiences, such as practicums, have opportunities to be involved in the planning of this type of CBL. This involvement will also help ensure that field supervisors have clear expectations of students' activities as they relate to their program of study and their own role in supervising students. Recommendations to improve relationships and partnerships are crucial to ensuring positive outcomes for both students and host organisations in the future. The results from this study can be used to inform the development of CBL opportunities in other universities and other human service disciplines, which is essential to producing a skilled workforce in Kenya and other developing countries.

References

- Alexander, G & Khabanyane, M 2013, 'Service learning as a response to community/school engagement: Towards a pedagogy of engagement', *Perspectives in Education*, vol. 31, no. 2: pp. 102–13.
- Astin, A, Sax, L & Avalos J 1999, 'Long-term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years', *Review of Higher Education*, vol. 22, no. 2: pp. 187–202.
- Basinger, N & Bartholomew, K 2006, 'Service-learning in nonprofit organizations: Motivations, expectations, and outcomes', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 12, no. 2: pp. 15–26.
- Batchelder, T & Root S 1994, 'Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes', *Journal of Adolescence*, vol. 17, no. 4: pp. 341–55. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.1994.1031>
- Bheekie, A & van Huyssteen, M 2015, 'Be mindful of your discomfort: An approach to contextualized learning', *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, vol. 3, no. 1: viewed November 2017. <http://journals.sfu.ca/iarslce/index.php/journal/article/view/129/79>
- Braun, V & Clarke, V 2006, 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2: pp. 77–101. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bringle, R & Clayton, P 2013, 'Conceptual frameworks for partnerships in service learning: Implications for research', in P Clayton, R Bringle & J Hatcher, *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*, Vol. 2B: Communities, institutions, and partnerships, Stylus, Sterling, VA, pp. 539–79.
- Bringle, R & Hatcher, J 2007, 'Civic engagement and service learning: Implications for higher education in America and South Africa', *Education as Change*, vol. 11, no. 3: pp. 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823200709487181>
- Cantor, J 1995, *Experiential learning in higher education (Report Number 7)*, The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Washington, DC.
- Clayton, P, Bringle, R & Hatcher, J 2013, *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*, Vol. 2B: Communities, institutions, and partnerships, Stylus, Sterling, VA.
- Cooper, L & Orrell, J n.d., *The practicum: The domestic work of university teaching*, viewed 15 April 2016. www.flinders.edu.au/Teaching_and_Learning_Files/wil/domestic.pdf
- Cruz, N & Giles, D 2000, 'Where's the community in service-learning?', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Special Issue, pp. 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1319267>
- Dorasamy, N & Pillay, S 2010, 'Advocating service learning for developing citizenship in university students in South Africa', *Industry and Higher Education*, vol. 24, no. 4: pp. 287–96. <https://doi.org/10.5367/000000010792609736>

- Enos, S & Morton, K 2003, 'Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnership', in B Jacoby & Associates (eds), *Building partnerships for service-learning*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 20–41.
- Ferguson, I & Smith, L 2012, 'Education for change: Student placements in campaigning organisations and social movements in South Africa', *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 42, no. 5: pp. 974–94. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr143>
- Giles, D & Eyler, J 1994, 'The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes', *Journal of Adolescence*, vol. 17, no. 4: pp. 327–39. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jado.1994.1030>
- Gower, R & Mulvaney, M 2012, *Making the most of your practicum: A strategic approach*, Sagamore Publishing LLC, Urbana, IL.
- Gudo, C, Olel, M & Oanda, I 2011, 'University expansion in Kenya and issues of quality education: Challenges and opportunity', *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, vol. 2, no. 20: pp. 203–14.
- Haneef, M, Yusof, S & Amin, R 2006, *Values, market needs and higher education curriculum: The quest for comprehensive development*, Malaysia International Islamic University, Kuala Lumpur.
- Hatcher, J & Erasmus, M 2008, 'Service-learning in the United States and South Africa: A comparative analysis informed by John Dewey and Julius Nyerere', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 15, no. 1: pp. 49–61, viewed November 2017. <http://hdl.handle.net/1805/4585>
- Janke, E 2013, 'Organizational partnerships in service learning', in P Clayton, R Bringle & J Hatcher, *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*, Vol. 2B: Communities, institutions, and partnerships, Stylus, Sterling, VA, pp. 573–98.
- Johnson, E, Bailey, K-R & Padmore, J 2012, 'Issues and challenges of social work practicum in Trinidad and Tobago and India', *Caribbean Teaching Scholar*, vol. 2, no. 1: pp.19–29.
- Kathuri-Ogola, L, VanLeeuwen, C, Kabaria-Muriithi, J, Weeks, L, Kieru, J & Ndayala, P 2015, 'Supervision challenges encountered during Kenyan university students' practicum attachment', *Journal of Education and Practice*, vol. 6, no. 17: pp. 111–17.
- Klosters, D 2014, *Matching skills and labour market needs: Building social partnerships for better skills and better jobs*, World Economic Forum, Switzerland.
- Kuh, G 2008, *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.
- Leiderman, S, Furco, A, Zapf, J & Goss, M 2002, *Building partnerships with college campuses: Community perspectives*, Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, DC, viewed 18 January 2018. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED481879.pdf>
- Linda, N, Mtshali, N & Engelbrecht, C 2013, 'Lived experiences of a community regarding its involvement in a university community-based education programme', *Curationis*, vol. 36, no. 1: pp. 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.4102/curationis.v36i1.78>

- Mahlomaholo, S & Matobako, T 2006, 'Service learning in South Africa held terminally captive by legacies of the past', *Alternation Journal*, vol. 13, no. 1: pp. 203–17.
- Marshall, C 2011, *Designing qualitative research*, 5th edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- McClam, T & Puckett, K 1991, 'Pre-field human services majors' ideas about supervisors', *Human Service Education*, vol. 11, no. 1: pp. 23–30.
- Mgaya, K & Mbekomize C 2014, 'Benefits to host organizations from participating in internship programs in Botswana', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, vol. 15, no. 2: pp. 129–44.
- Miron, D & Moely, B 2006, 'Community agency voice and benefit in service-learning', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 12, no. 2: pp. 27–37.
- Naidoo, B & Devnarain, B 2009, 'Service learning: Connecting higher education and civil society: Are we meeting the challenge?', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 23, no. 5: pp. 935–52. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v23i5.48809>
- Nichols, N, Anucha, U, Houwer, R & Wood, M 2013, 'Building equitable community-academic research collaborations: Learning together through tensions and contradictions', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 6, pp. 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v6i1.2822>
- Nyangau, J 2014, 'Higher education for economic growth in Kenya', *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, vol. 1, no. 1: article 3.
- Oanda, I & Jowi, J 2012, 'University expansion and the challenges to social development in Kenya: Dilemmas and pitfalls', *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, vol. 10, no. 1: pp. 49–71.
- Odhiambo, G 2014, 'Quality assurance for public higher education: Context, strategies and challenges in Kenya', *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 33, no. 5: pp. 978–91. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2014.890578
- Olson, K & Montgomery, B 2000, 'Expectations of family and consumers sciences undergraduate interns', *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, vol. 18, no. 2: pp. 15–23.
- Opiyo-Newa, E 2012, 'Assessing the practicum program in universities: Case study of United States International University (USIU)', *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa*, vol. 3, no. 2: pp. 104–27.
- Osman, R & Castle, J 2006, 'Theorising service learning in higher education in South Africa', *Perspectives in Education*, vol. 24, no. 3: pp. 63–70.
- Owuor, J 2007, 'Integrating African indigenous knowledge in Kenya's formal education system: The potential for sustainable development', *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, vol. 2, no. 2: pp. 21–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20355/C5Z594>
- Patton, M 2015, *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*, 4th edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Paul, E 2009, 'Community-based undergraduate research: Collaborative inquiry for the public good', in B Jacoby (ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Peters, J 2014, Work-integrated learning in Ontario's postsecondary sector: The pathways of recent college and university graduates, Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, Toronto, ON.

Republic of Kenya 2007, Kenya Vision 2030, abridged (popular) version.
www.vision2030.go.ke/vision-2030-publications/

Republic of Kenya 2013, Second medium term plan, 2013–2017: Transforming Kenya: Pathway to devolution, socio-economic development, equity and national unity, Government of the Republic of Kenya, viewed 19 January 2018. www.devolutionplanning.go.ke/?publication=second-medium-term-plan-2013-2017

Roos, V, Temane, Q, Davis, L, Prinsloo, C, Kritzinger, A, Naude, E & Wessels, J 2005, 'Service learning in a community context: Learners' perceptions of a challenging training paradigm', *South African Journal of Psychology*, vol. 35, no. 4: pp. 703–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630503500406>

Sandy, M & Holland, B 2006, 'Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 13, no. 1: pp. 30–43.

Stanton, T & Erasmus, M 2013, 'Inside out, outside in: A comparative analysis of service-learning's development in the United States and South Africa', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 17, no. 1: pp. 61–94.

Steinke, P & Buresh, S 2002, 'Cognitive outcomes of service-learning: Reviewing the past and glimpsing the future', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 8, no. 2: pp. 5–14.

Teichler, U 2011, 'Bologna – Motor or stumbling block for the mobility and employability of graduates?', in H Schomburg & U Teichler (eds), *Employability and mobility of bachelor graduates in Europe*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, pp. 3–41.

Thomson, A, Smith-Tolken, A, Naidoo, A & Bringle, R 2011, 'Service learning and community engagement: A comparison of three national contexts', *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Official Journal of the International Society for Third-Sector Research, vol. 22, no. 2: pp. 214–37.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11266-010-9133-9>

Tiessen, R & Heron, B 2012, 'Volunteering in the developing world: The perceived impacts of Canadian youth', *Development in Practice*, vol. 22, no. 1: pp. 44–56.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2012.630982>

Tumuti, D, Mule, L, Gecaga, M & Manguriu, D 2013, 'Enhancing graduate employability through community engagement: A case study of students' community service at Kenyatta University', *Journal of Administrative Sciences and Policy Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 1–14.

VanLeeuwen, CA, Kathuri-Ogola, L, Weeks, LE & Kabaria-Muriithi, JK, 2018, 'Getting ready for community practice: An evidence-based preparation course for Kenyan practicum students', *Family and Consumer Science Research Journal*, vol 46, no. 3, pp. 238–251.
doi: [10.1111/fcsr.12248](https://doi.org/10.1111/fcsr.12248)

Waruru, M 2015, 'Universities ordered to stop non-degree courses', *University World News*, iss. 367, 15 May, viewed 19 January

2018. www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20150514122242452

Weert, E 2011, *Perspectives on higher education and the labour market: Review of international policy developments*, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, The Netherlands.

Worrall, L 2007, 'Asking the community: A case study of community partner perspectives', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1: pp. 5–17.

Khojaly: Massacre or genocide (legal-political analysis)

Zaur Aliyev B.

PhD in political sciences, docent
Scientific secretary of the Institute of History of ANAS
zaur.aliyev@gmail.com

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/jpapyr.776v439>

Abstract

Khojaly events are massacres or genocide? So far, these two concepts have been widely used in the media, but no mutual comparison has been encountered. However, without being aware of these concepts, some of the media workers are describing the event as a massacre and others as genocide. In fact, these two concepts are different from each other due to their etymology and legal value. The slaughter of all the people of a country captured by the "massacre" in the explanatory dictionary of the Azerbaijani language is considered as mass slaughter. In the international law books, the massacre is often celebrated because of differences in race, religion, or political thought. Sometimes it is possible to find a person who is suffering from mental disability by targeting them and targeting individuals and groups. For example, we can illustrate the case of Anders Breivik, a terrorist and Norwegian murderer, who killed 77 civilian citizens in the Norwegian capital, Oslo.

Keywords: *Khojali, massacre, genocide, disability, Azerbaijan*

Introduction

In the international law, the word "genosid" is derived from the Greek word "genos", which means "genocide", which means "genocide", which means "killing" in Latin, which means "killing" was first used as a term in 1944 by a Polish Jewish lawyer, Rafael Lemkin, who expressed the European policy of mass destruction

of European Jews by the Nazis on the national level. [1]

For the first time in the history of politics, criminal acts aimed at massive destruction of human groups by national, ethnic, racial or religious origin were first called "genocide" in international law. It is written internationally and in the local law: "Genocide is the thoughtful and systematic complete or partial extermination of ethnic,

racial, religious or national groups." This is the second edition of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, the national, ethnic, racial or religious group: - kill members of the group; substantial physical or mental harm to group members, considerably lowering the living conditions of the group for complete or partial physical destruction of the group; take measures to prevent births that will be in the group; (and) transferring children from one group to another by force - one ". On 9 December 1948, the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted. [2]

8 generations have been destroyed in Khojaly. This is the most terrible event in the world so far.

1. Mammadov Vagif Shukur oglu father, 1940
2. Mammadova Afila Ibrahim qizi is born in 1949
3. Mammadov Azer Vagif oglu son of 1972
4. Mammadov Jeyhun Vagif oglu, son, 1975
5. Mammadov Niyamaddin Vagif oglu oghlu 1978
1. Karimov Samran Soltan born in 1924
2. Kerimova Firangiz Mom 1935
3. Kerimov Firuz Samran oglu son of 1960
4. Kerimov Soltan Samran oglu son born in 1969
1. Aliyev Firdovsi Jesus son of father 1956
2. Aliyeva Heyran Murshud gizi is born in 1962
3. Aliyev Elchin Firdovsi oglu oguz 1982
4. Aliyev Elgiz Firdovsi oghlu son 1984

1. Ganbarov Karsalan Garay son father in 1939
2. Ganbarova Valide Boran, born in 1941
3. Ganbarov Nadir Karsalan, son of the son, 1971
1. Ganbarov Safar Garsalan born in 1961
2. Ganbarova Matanat Haji qizi the mother of 1967
3. Ganbarov Emin Safar oghlu oglu was born in 1986
4. Ganbarova Esmira Safar's daughter girl 1985
1. Huseynov Mirsiyab Hadratqulu oglu husband 1922
2. Huseynova Minash Jumshud daughter wife 1934
1. Hasanova Gunash Abdulgizi qizi is born in 1910
2. Hasanova Qatisa Mirtsyab daughter daughter 1951
1. Huseynov Huseyn Ismayil oglu father, 1934
2. Huseynova Aziz Shopping daughter mother 1956
3. Huseynov Husbal Huseyn oglu son 1963
4. Huseynov Tacir Huseyn oglu son 1972
5. Huseynova Nasiba Huseyn gizi girl 1982

According to Article 2 of that convention, the killing of members of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, severe bodily injuries, intentional creation of a life-threatening condition for the full or partial destruction of any group, taking actions, taking children out of a group of people and giving them to someone else are considered "genocide". According to Article 3 of the Convention, genocide, confidentiality aimed at committing such acts, direct and indirect motive for committing genocides, committed genocide or genocide, are

regarded as committed and punishable by genocide. The Criminal Code also stipulates a special substance (Article 105 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Azerbaijan) and it is noted that without the genocide, the total and partial demolition of the population is regarded as the crime of the demolition of the population. The genocide is referred to another article in the Criminal Code of the Republic of Azerbaijan (Article 103) and it is indicated that the killing of group members in order to destroy any national, ethnic, racial or religious group as a group, creating serious conditions for the health of members, or serious injury to their mental abilities, creating conditions for the whole or partial physical destruction of the group, undertaking measures aimed at preventing births within the group, and transferring children belonging to one group to another group constitutes a genocide crime. The actions of Armenians who committed the Khojaly tragedy should be cited in this article of the criminal code. [3]

This event is called "Khojaly massacre" and "Khojaly genocide" in Azerbaijan and in Turkey. In Armenia this operation is expressed in terms of "Khojaly war", "Khojaly events". The western and world press prefers to use the term "Khojaly massacre" (eg, "Khojaly Massacre", fr., "Massacre de Khodjaly"). However, article 6 of the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 19 December 1948, the Criminal and Criminal Procedure Codes of the Republic of Azerbaijan, in competent courts or in jurisdictions, to examine its jurisdiction at the International Criminal Tribunal and to take all legitimate measures to adequately

punish those guilty. The Criminal Code of the Republic of Azerbaijan contains all the provisions for the prosecution of genocide and other crimes committed in Khojaly.

Facts about Armenia's failure to ignore international legal norms during the war do not end there. Under the requirements of international humanitarian law, war should only be exercised between the armed forces of the armed conflict parties. Civilian population should not be involved in battles and should be treated with respect. Under Article 3 of the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in the Event of Civil War, the intent of the civilian life and security is to assassinate civilians, including their killing, crippling, cruel treatment, torture and torture, human dignity, insult and humiliation actions are forbidden. Article 33 of the Convention states that no civilian can be punished for any offense he has committed. Collective penalties against civilians, fears of civilians, terrorist acts against them, and exposure to repression are strictly forbidden. According to Article 34 of the Convention, the seizure of the civilian population is also prohibited. However, Armenians, who hosted more than 1,000 people in Khojaly, have also shown disregard for this principle. The Armenian armed forces ignored these norms and resorted to the most brutal methods for peaceful civilians in Khojaly.

As a result of the Khojaly genocide and other tragedies in occupied Armenia, the rights and freedoms as well as the right of people to live in a gross violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and other international instruments have

been grossly violated, people's honor and dignity have been upheld. It should be noted that in the world practice, there were many such cases. For example, after gaining independence in Burundi in 1962 there were two incidents of genocide. In the last report of the International Research Commission for Burundi, which was submitted to the UN Security Council in 2002, the massacre of bullets by the captive army in 1972 and the massacre committed by the Hutu population in 1993 were recognized as genocide. Another example is the Sabra and Shatila massacres committed by the Lebanese Maronite Christians / Falanga military forces in the Palestinian refugee camps in Sabra and Shatila in September 1982-2000, near the start of the Southern Lebanon conflict in 1982-2000. The number of victims of the massacre is estimated at 700-3500. The blame for the massacre belongs to the Pharaohs as the executor and to Israel, who is indirectly the allies of the Pharaohs.

On December 16, 1982, the UN General Assembly recognized the massacre and declared it a genocide act. Section 2, which is considered to be a massacre of a massacre, passed 98 votes against 19 voices and 23 did not take part in the voting. All Western democracies did not participate in the voting, but the term killing was replaced by the term "genocide" in this process. All of this suggests that, Crime in Khojaly was a genocide. Because the goal was to destroy a group of people living in a specific area and belonging to a specific national identity. The developers, the instructors and their executives have reached their goals and have destroyed most of the population without care of age and sex.

What happened in Khojaly was a crime against humanity. Because the party carrying out the operation has given control over the city and has been cruel to the civilian population, killing all the people of the age group, tortured, captured, persecuted long psychological and physical pressure, sexual harassment, forced pregnancy, cruel, and hostile atrocities against civilian and non-military operations.

What happened in Khojaly was a military offense. Because the murders that took place, other violent movements, the destruction of the city completely went far beyond the limits necessary to achieve military objectives. The purpose of the operation was not only the occupation of an administrative territorial unit, but also the destruction of the residents and the city itself.

Crime and aggression crimes against humanity are included in the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. It is part of the International Criminal Court's jurisdiction in the international terrorism included in the International Criminal Tribunal. According to the Statute of the International Criminal Court, the application of the principles of universal jurisdiction against international crimes, including international crimes, is envisaged.

The International Criminal Court was established on 17 July 1998 at the United Nations Diplomatic Conference in Rome, Italy. This court has been established as a permanent body authorized to exercise jurisdiction over persons responsible for the most serious crimes of concern to the international community. Under Article 5, 6 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal, this tribunal has the au-

thority to admit and prosecute genocide crimes.

In addition, according to the *Ratione temporis* jurisdiction of Rome (Article 11), the court has jurisdiction only after the date of the entry into force of the status, ie after the crimes committed after June 17, 1998. [4]

Under Article 5 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the jurisdiction of this court may be applied only to States party to the Rome Statute. In the Hague tribunal, the issue can then be considered that the offenses were committed by a national of a State which ratified the status of Rome and ratified the status of Rome.

It can also be seen in cases where murders of genocide are committed in an international peace and security situation and apply to the International Criminal Court in accordance with section VII of the UN Security Council Charter. Due to the fact that these legal bases and legal conditions are not present, it is impossible to consider the case of the Khojaly genocide in the Hague tribunal.

The International Criminal Court has the jurisdiction of the following three cases:

1. The alleged criminal offense is committed in the territory of the State of Rome or of a national of that State;
2. States not party to the Rome Statute are entitled at hoc, by recognizing the authority of the International Criminal Tribunal;
3. Requests the International Criminal Tribunal to conduct an investigation into a case where the UN Security Council has one or more offenses. [5]

At the same time, under Article 11 of the Rome Statute, the International Crimi-

nal Court has jurisdiction over the offenses that have emerged. If any State later becomes a member of the International Criminal Court, it may be deemed to have joined the Rome Statute since the date of the International Criminal Court's establishment by a special declaration by that State. Otherwise, the provisions of the Statute shall apply to that State from the date on which the Statute is approved by the State. It can also recognize the authority of the International Criminal Court with a statement of the same offense in connection with the offense of a State not party to the Statute. [6]

The human rights center "Memorial" affirmed that "actions of the Armenian armed forces of Nagorno-Karabakh against the civilian population of Khojaly in the city of Khojaly during the attack were adopted by the Geneva Conventions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948) roughly contradicts:

Article 2 Everyone is free to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without prejudice to any other language, religion, national origin, or other affiliation.

Article 3 Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the right to personal inviolability.

Article 5. It is forbidden for a person to be subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.

Article 9. Illegal arrests, detention or exile are forbidden.

Article 17. Everyone has the right to own property and this right can not be restricted by law.

The actions of the armed forces brutally violate the Declaration on the Protection of Women, adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 14, 1972 in the conditions of emergency and armed conflict " [7]

The world experience fully confirms that the murderers of the Khojaly massacre can be considered in the gravest crimes court of Khojaly in Azerbaijan. Because the Khojaly genocide was committed on the territory of Azerbaijan against the Azerbaijanis, who were former citizens of Azerbaijan, and Azerbaijani Turks.

This is entirely in line with the requirements of national and international law. Because of the principle of universal jurisdiction to prosecute genocide and other international offenses is the duty of Azerbaijan, its investigative and judicial authorities. It is also possible to establish the International Criminal Court on the Khojaly genocide or the crimes of peace and humanity committed against the Azerbaijanis by Armenia or its separatist forces and servicemen in general on the basis of the laws of Azerbaijan.

Because the Azerbaijani side can prove that what Armenians committed in the Khojaly genocide violates the Geneva Conventions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the 77th Anniversary of the International Humanitarian Law. At the same time, the prohibited methods of combatting the International Humanitarian Law (the Hague right) were also grossly violated during the Khojaly incident.

An investigation group established to investigate the bloody events in Khojaly has conducted a forensic medical examination of the corpse of 181 people. It has been known that most of the dead were shot

dead at a distance, mostly shot dead and shot dead by children between the ages of 2 and 15 years. The heads of the corpses, their ears, their eyes removed, the skulls were scattered, the skins were peeled off, the women were harassed, and many bodies were damaged and unrecognizable.

At the same time, the following articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were violated in Khojaly genocide.

Article 2 Everyone shall have all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as his tongue, religion, nationality, or any other extermination.

Article 3 Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 5. Degrading human dignity, inhuman or degrading treatment is prohibited.

Article 9. Arbitrary arrests, detention or expulsion are prohibited.

Article 17. Everyone has the right to own property and is forbidden to arbitrarily deprive a person of his property. [8]

The petition filed by the Republic of Azerbaijan shall be secured by the UN Security Council. In the event that a special criminal court of the Khojaly genocide is established on the basis of existing disputes and procedures and in line with the requirements of international law, it may be ensured that adequate penalties may be imposed on those accused in the same court. [9]

There are also all legal grounds for this, and confirmed by Jean-Paul Murman, the judge of the Belgian Constitutional Court. He noted that the same courts were established in connection with the genocides in Kosovo, Lebanon, Iraq and other

countries. He said international experts should be involved in such trials, investigations should be made, and relevant decisions should be made. Those who commit such crimes against humanity must be found and punished. Jean-Paul Murman said that any state support and protection of persons committing such offenses would result in re-occurring crimes in the future. [10]

At the same time, when we address the UN Security Council at the international conference of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in Stockholm on January 24, 2004, we can lay the groundwork for it.

The president of the Khojaly events is the president of Armenia. It happened during the period when Serzh Sargsyan was the head of the "self-defense committee" of the illegal separatist regime, and his memories are one of the most important evidence in this area. Sarkisian's words do not make any doubt about the executors of crimes committed in Khojaly: *Before the Khojaly, the Azerbaijanis thought that they were joking with us, thinking that Armenians could not raise their hands against the civilian population. We could break this [stereotype]. And that's what happened. And we should also take into account that those children were fleeing from Baku and Sumgayit.*

Serj Sarkisyan

Asked whether the journalist regretted the deaths of thousands of people, Serj Sarkisyan answered shamelessly:

I do not regret it ... even if thousands of people die, this kind of stride is necessary. [11]

Serj Sarkisyan

Human rights defender from minority Armenians who recognize the fact of committing genocide in Armenia in Khojaly Mikael Danielyan and journalist Vahe Avetyancan be mentioned. [12]

Canadian Canadian lawyer Vaskel Sitaryan writes in the March 26, 1992, issue of Spain's Levante: "We Armenians have humiliated ourselves in the world on the events of February 26 in Khojaly. International courts, which are hard for us, will be established. Who dragged the Armenian nation to the court doors? "

One of the representatives of the Helsinki Citizens Assembly for Nagorno-Karabakh, Karen Ohankanyan, said in an interview: "I am the only person in Armenia that I personally apologize to myself for the violence against civilians living in Khojaly."

At present Recognition of the Khojaly genocide As one of the main directions of Azerbaijan's foreign policy. Apart from Azerbaijan, Khojaly as a full-blown massacre Pakistan and Sudan recognizes

The tragedy is like a parliamentary scandal Mexico, Colombia, Czech Republic, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Peru, Honduras, Panama, Jordan and Romania recognizes. [13]

To date 21 US states have adopted a document recognizing Khojaly as a massacre.

November 20, 2012 Posted by Djibouti At the 39th session of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), a resolution was adopted that

recognized Khojaly genocide as genocide. [14]

New York Times, Boston Globe, Wall Street Journal, Sunday Times, Chicago Tribune newspapers, Associated Press, Washington Post, The New York Times, press ", and" Time "have taken an important place [15]

In the UK, Reuters, The Times, Sunday Times, The Guardian, BBC, and other media outlets have reported on the Khojaly genocide. Times journalist Anatol Lieven, who travels to Nagorno Karabakh together with many foreign journalists, writes on his findings after returning to his country:

"When we climbed over the snow-capped hills of Nagorno-Karabakh, we saw the scattered bodies ... It was obvious that the refugees were exposed to fire when they fled to save themselves ... The civilian helicopter took four corpses, and the Azerbaijani cameraman took dozens of corpses in the hills. we looked at the corpses collected by the civilian helicopter. The two-year-old man and a young girl's body were covered with blood, and their lower extremities were wrapped in cold and severe conditions,

On 15 February 2003, the Khojaly refugees applied to the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

(OSCE). The main purpose of the appeal was to convey to the world-renowned international organizations - the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) - about the Khojaly genocide committed by Armenians in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan in February 1992 and to give a legal and political assessment to this bloody crime it was t.

In its judgment of 22 April 2010, the European Court of Human Rights ruled that Khojaly's demilitarization of the civilian population of Azerbaijan was "war crimes or especially serious crimes that could be regarded as crimes against humanity." [16]

In its judgment of 22 April 2010, the European Court of Human Rights states:

"Reports derived from independent sources show that during the Khojaly massacre on February 25-26, 1992, hundreds of Azerbaijani ethnic minorities were killed by Armenian armed men attacking the city when attempting to leave the occupied city, was wounded and taken hostage." [17]

Unfortunately, the Khojaly genocide, which has resulted in massive and gross violations of human rights, has not yet been legally assessed internationally, and no concrete measures have been taken against the terrorist and aggressive actions of Armenians.

References

- [1] William Schabas. Genocide in international law: the crimes of crimes. - Cambridge University Press, 2000. - p. 25
- [2] United Nations Treaty Collection (As of 9 October 2001): Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

[3] THE KHOJALY GENERATION IS THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL <http://supremecourt.gov.az/static/view/175>

[4] Rome statute of the international criminal court. http://legal.flour.org/icc/statute/99_corr/cstatute.htm

[5] The International Criminal Court, <http://www.mup-info.com/mup/international-court>

[6] Rafael FIGURE BRAYILOV "The world is beginning to recognize the Khojaly realities" "The Republic." February 25, 2012. - N 45.- S 6.

[7] The Khojaly tragedy is an integral part of the policy of targeted genocidal policy of the Armenian people against the Azerbaijani people as an international crime "Revivalism", 2004, No. 96-97, p. 49-55.

[8] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948. <http://www.migration.gov.az/images/pdf/935e2ca153e49bce078042398ff16c2d.pdf>

[9] Tatyana Goldman "International law unequivocally confirms the genocide of Khojaly massacre" "Azerbaijan" .- 2010.-23 February.-N 42.-S.6.

[10] Judge of Belgian Constitutional Court: International Criminal Court to be established on Khojaly events <http://az.trend.az/azerbaijan/karabakh/1996133.html>

[11] Thomas de Vaal, "Black Garden: Armenia and Azerbaijan through Peace and War" (New York and London, 2003), p. 172

[12] An Armenian who has apologized for the Khojaly genocide has died. "News.milli.a.

[13] "" International Recognition of The Khojaly Genocide "" . un.mfa.gov.az

[14] "INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION" . www.justiceforkhojaly.org

[15] Bayramqızı, legend. "Khojaly genocide through the eyes of the international press" . www.xalqqazeti.com.

[16] Today is the 24th anniversary of the Khojaly Genocide . " Geneva.mfa.gov.az.

[17] "Award-winning Xojaly documentary screened in Brussels" . azertag.az.

New models of excellence In Higher education

Gover M. Eyler

1 Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences,
Lakehead University

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v11i1.5527>

Abstract

Academic institutions and community-based organisations have increasingly recognised the value of working together to meet their different objectives and address common societal needs. In an effort to support the development and maintenance of these partnerships, a diversity of brokering initiatives has emerged. We broadly describe these initiatives as coordinating mechanisms that act as intermediaries with the aim of developing collaborative and sustainable partnerships that provide mutual benefit. A broker can be an individual or an organisation that helps connect and support relationships and shares knowledge. To date, there has been little scholarly discussion or analysis of the various elements of these initiatives that contribute to successful community-campus partnerships. In an effort to better understand where these features may align or diverge, we reviewed a sample of community-campus brokering initiatives across North America, Canada and the United Kingdom to identify their different roles and activities. From this review, we developed a framework to delineate characteristics of different brokering initiatives to better understand their contribution to successful partnerships. The framework is divided into two parts. The first part examines the different structural allegiances of the brokering initiative by identifying the affiliation and principle purpose, and who received the primary benefits. The second part considers the dimensions of brokering activities in respect of their level of engagement, platforms used, scale of activity, and area of focus. The intention of the community-campus engagement brokering framework is to provide an analytical tool for academics and community-based practitioners engaged in teaching and research partnerships. The categories describing the different structures and dimensions of the brokering initiative will encourage participants to think through the overall goals and objectives of the partnership and adapt the initiative accordingly.

Keywords: *brokering initiatives; community-based research; community-campus engagement; partnerships; service learning*

Introduction

Academic institutions and community-based organisations have increasingly recognised the value of working together to meet their different objectives and address common societal needs. Building effective research and teaching collaborations between communities (e.g. organisations in the private, public and non-profit sectors) and academics (e.g. postsecondary students, postdoctoral fellows, instructors, professors and their institutions) have resulted in many fruitful outcomes (Buys & Bursnall 2007; Hart, Maddison & Wolff 2007). Schwartz et al. (2016, p. 178) explain that community-campus partnerships can provide 'an avenue to address challenges that face society in new and innovative ways by bringing together knowledge, tools, and skills not previously combined'. Examples exist across a range of sectors and issue areas including community food security (Andrée et al. 2014; Andrée et al. 2016), poverty reduction (Calderón 2007; Schwartz et al. 2016), violence against women (Bell et al. 2004; Jaffe, Berman & MacQuarrie 2011), and community environmental sustainability (Baker 2006; Molnar et al. 2010), to name only a few. While a diversity of approaches exists, in ideal conditions of community-campus engagement (CCE), partners share decision-making and equalise power throughout the research process (Lindamer et al. 2009), co-develop mutually beneficial outputs and outcomes (Levkoe et al. 2016; Naqshbandi et al. 2011), build capacity for under-resourced community-based organisations (Baquet 2012; Sandy & Hol-

land 2006), engage new perspectives to increase knowledge (McNall et al. 2009), and sustain an ability to work together beyond the life of a specific project (Naqshbandi et al. 2011).

Despite the many successes, community-based practitioners involved in CCE have faced a number of challenges. While community groups typically enter into research relationships being promised mutually beneficial outcomes, studies show that academics and their institutions often benefit far more from these kinds of partnerships (Alcantara et al. 2015; Bortolin 2011; Cronley, Madden & Davis 2015). For community partners, barriers to participating in CCE can include limited time and resources to fully engage (Keyte 2014; Lantz et al. 2001), minimal support for building and maintaining partnerships (Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen 2011; Petri 2015; Sandy & Holland 2006), power imbalances (Schwartz et al. 2016), lack of trust (Lantz et al. 2001; Petri 2015) and high levels of staff and volunteer turnover (Keyte 2014; Schwartz et al. 2016; Van Devanter et al. 2011). Despite recognition of these challenges, institutional structures are typically designed to support academics (Cronley, Madden & Davis 2015; Dempsey 2010; Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2000). Studies have also identified significant barriers faced by academics when participating in CCE, including having limited time and resources and being discouraged from community-engaged pedagogies through tenure and promotion structures (Levkoe, Brial & Danier 2014). While most responses tend to occur on a case-by-case basis, some have called for more institutionalised

and sustained support mechanisms (Chen 2013; Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen, 2011).

CCE brokers have emerged as one response to these challenges. In this article, we broadly describe brokering initiatives as coordinating mechanisms that act as intermediaries between community-based organisations and academic institutions with an aim to develop collaborative and sustainable partnerships. A broker is an individual or organisation that helps connect and support relationships and share knowledge. While many different forms of brokering initiatives have emerged, there has been little synthesis or analysis on the various features of these initiatives that contribute to successful partnerships. Most brokering initiatives share a common goal of fostering relationships between community and campus partners; yet, they tend to be heterogeneous in their motivations, mandates, organisational structures, target groups, activities, and the sectors they serve. Because brokering initiatives differ on so many dimensions, it is necessary to consider their similarities and differences and assess which elements may be valuable for a particular type of CCE.

In this article, we present a framework for comparative analysis that identifies the different features, roles and activities of CCE brokering initiatives. This framework provides an analytical tool for academics and community-based practitioners to reflect on how the different characteristics of brokering initiatives may contribute to successful CCE partnerships. We begin by summarising the relevant literature, describing key features of CCE brokers, their

different functions, and the various factors for success and challenges they face.

Describing and differentiating CCE brokering initiatives.

Brokering initiatives aim to support participants at different stages of a partnership and vary depending on their structures, targeted populations and specific activities. Experiences of CCE tend to be context-specific and a CCE broker's role is dependent on the specific project and the needs and assets of each partner. Brokering initiatives must also be flexible and open to change depending on the phase of the relationship. Tennyson (2005) identified three key differences, which provide a basis for understanding how brokering initiatives are working within one of the partnering organisations and taking responsibility for preparing and conditioning the different actors, representing the organisation for the duration of the partnership, and managing various aspects of the collaboration. Internal brokers bring together relevant partners but may also share in decision-making throughout a project. These functions can be compared to those of external brokers who may be contracted by the partners to set up agreements, build capacity, and/or maintain and track ongoing effectiveness. External brokers support partners and equip them with tools to ensure the project is moving forward, but tend to take on little, if any, decision-making responsibility. Second, a broker can be an individual or a team working within or outside one of the partner organisations and tasked with building relationships on behalf of the organisation. Third, proactive brokers initiate and build partnerships,

while reactive brokers coordinate partnerships or implement decisions on an organisation's behalf. While some CCE brokers play a key role in developing a partnership, others support a partnership after its initiation. The three differences identified by Tennyson demonstrate that brokers can take on many roles, depending on the particular partners' needs.

Besides recognising the many differences, Tennyson and Baksi (2016) point to a series of common roles and activities among brokers. These include supporting partners throughout the phases in the partnership cycle from scoping and building (e.g. providing outreach and opportunities to engage, managing expectations), managing and maintaining (e.g. facilitating dialogue and governance arrangements, problem-solving), reviewing and revising (e.g. establishing and implementing an ongoing evaluation plan, supporting changes to the partnership) to sustaining outcomes (e.g. knowledge mobilisation, celebrating achievements, managing closure/next steps). Given the variation in the needs of partners and partnership phases, brokers are likely to take on many roles within and across projects, developing a suite of skills to support and benefit partnerships. While some brokering initiatives take on a single role across community-campus partnerships, such as making an initial connection between two partners, others assume a combination of roles, supporting partners throughout the life of a project.

Specific to community-campus projects, CCE brokers act as an intermediary between community-based organisations and academic institutions. They have been

shown to support community and academic partners in designing and implementing a project, establishing initial connections, delivering skills training, problem-solving, supervising students' community-engaged research and learning activities, evaluating a project's impact, and using results to improve future programs while contributing to positive changes in communities (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015; Tennyson 2014). CCE brokers have also promoted learnings and insights, and addressed concerns of power and resource imbalance by ensuring community and campus partners share control equitably (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015). In addition, because community organisations and universities face high levels of personnel turnover, CCE brokers can help by sustaining a project over the long term (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). To avoid leaving community-based organisations with unfinished projects, CCE brokers can help overcome constraints of an academic schedule by continuing to complete tasks after the end of a term.

In particular, brokering initiatives can be an accessible and responsive point of contact (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). For example, community-based organisations have expressed interest in having platforms to share research needs and interests, connect with academics and learn about opportunities for professional development (Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen 2011; Tryon & Stoecker 2008). Brokering initiatives use physical platforms that include providing accessible office space and community workspaces, and staging events that bring partners and other stakeholders to-

gether. They also use virtual platforms such as websites, forums and matchmaking databases to bring diverse partners together to share ideas and information, especially when they are not in the same place. Lacking, however, is an understanding of how these different activities meet partners' needs and the opportunities and limitations faced by CCE brokers when developing collaborations.

Factors for success and challenges of brokering initiatives.

In this section, we draw on the existing scholarly literature to highlight factors for success and challenges in initiating and maintaining brokering initiatives and CCE partnerships.

Factors for Success

During the early stages of developing a brokering initiative, significant planning and investment is required (Tryon & Ross 2012). To improve the chances for success when setting up a brokering initiative, Pauzé and Level 8 Leadership Institute (2013) stressed the importance of first identifying the goals of the brokering initiative and then selecting a governance structure accordingly. Further, studies have found that brokering initiatives can benefit from having more formalised administrative infrastructure (Keating & Sjoquist 2000), a clear definition of their relationship with partnerships (Tennyson 2005), established guidelines and tools to address partners' needs (Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015) and flexibility in providing long-term support (Dorow, Stack-Cutler & Varnhagen 2011).

CCE brokers must also give significant attention to planning before brokering partnerships and initiating projects. For example, brokers at the Institute for Sustainable Solutions at Portland State University developed a strategy screen to map out potential impacts and the resources required by partners to help them decide on appropriate CCE projects. Accordingly, an ideal project should have a high impact while requiring low resources from community partners (Holliday, DeFalco & Sherman 2015). By considering the purpose of the brokering initiative and the capacity of the community-based organisation, CCE brokers can assess existing capacity (e.g. time, human resources, funds) to identify ways they can best support the partners as a project progresses (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). This is especially important, considering that both academic and community partners tend to lack sufficient time and resources for CCE.

Brokering initiatives can help academics share knowledge and research skills with community partners and address perceptions of CCE's uneven benefits (Keating & Sjoquist 2000; Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2000). To address issues of limited community capacity and trust, brokering initiatives can develop funding agreements to more equitably share financial resources, an activity complicated by most academic funding structures (Lantz et al. 2001; Naqshbandi et al. 2011; Phipps, Johnny & Wedlock 2015). Building trust, however, takes time and commitment, and is a long-term process. Indeed, Evans and McClinton-Brown (2016), brokers from the Stanford University Office of Community Health, attempted to build on their many

years of community-based work and their pre-existing relationships in an attempt to establish a community advisory board to support CCE efforts. Yet, they found that, in working out of the university, community members did not feel connected and many voiced feelings of alienation from the process. Through persistence and negotiation with the community advisory board members, an understanding was eventually established and the partnership was able to move forward. Likewise, in developing a pan-Canadian network of partners in First Nations communities, Naqshbandi et al. (2011) stressed the importance of valuing the different ways of knowing among the partners in order to be able to communicate in a manner that honoured and respected those involved (see Stiegman & Castleden 2015).

To achieve stability, CCE brokers benefit from identifying problems, developing strategies for overcoming challenges, putting plans in place, and providing ongoing evaluations (Naqshbandi et al. 2011). Brokering initiatives also require competent and consistent leadership to sustain themselves and the partnerships they support (Ivery 2010). As techniques and tools are refined, successful brokers are often able to empower and support the different partners without excessively controlling the partnership (Partnership Brokers Association 2012). In this way, they can play a management role, investing time and commitment but also being flexible as priorities develop and change (Lindamer et al. 2009). Tennyson (2005, p. 5) advised:

Good brokering is not a substitute for good partnering. It is always the partners themselves that are central to, and ulti-

mately responsible for, making their partnership work. So a good broker works continuously to build capacity and systems within the partnership – thereby promoting healthy interdependence between the partners rather than partner dependence on the broker.

Maintaining and sustaining brokering activities involves evaluating the process and developing strategies for continued engagement (Burke 2013; Evans & McClinton-Brown 2016). To establish an evidence-based process for monitoring brokering initiatives, Phipps, Johnny and Wedlock (2015) recommended tracking a broad range of outputs, including the number of opportunities for partnerships, the number of partnerships attempted, the number of partnerships developed, the reasons partnerships did not develop, and the impact of projects on partners. A utilisation-focused evaluation approach allows brokering initiatives to examine the partnership throughout the stages of the research process (Mundy 2013), which helps to identify successful partnership characteristics, key benefits, and challenges that can then be assessed (Hundal 2013; McNall et al. 2009). The Partnership Brokers Association (2016) recommends brokers use specific tools for self-assessment and professional reflection rather than reflecting generally on the partnership.

Challenges

There are several pitfalls that can affect the success of brokering initiatives. One common challenge occurs when CCE brokers fail to find the right balance between directing the partnership and letting

the partners lead. If brokers hold too tightly to their own ideas, it can be detrimental to the partnership (Partnership Brokers Association 2012). Thus, it is important for CCE brokers to know when to step back (Evans & McClinton-Brown 2016).

Another common challenge for CCE brokers is having to navigate project partners' perceptions and assumptions of research in general, and those of brokers in particular. For instance, while internal brokers may be well-informed and have experience working through organisational issues, partners may perceive them as biased in favour of their own organisation's way of operating and reluctant to accept new ideas. External brokers can be impartial to organisational politics, while partners may view them as being too distant and less committed when difficulties arise (Tennyson 2005). Because CCE brokers can be situated within or outside a partnership or community, they must proactively address partners' concerns.

Limited resources or a lack of core funding can also challenge the ability of a broker to provide useful services to sustain partnerships and projects (Naqshbandi et al. 2011). Without consistent funding sources, CCE brokers tend to devote significant effort towards grant writing (Baquet 2012; Keating & Sjoquist 2000). Keating and Sjoquist (2000, pp. 155–156) found that, in some instances, 'the choice of projects that are undertaken is largely determined by whatever kinds of projects are popular with funding agencies. The needs of communities can be overlooked if they do not require the kinds of projects that funding agencies are willing to underwrite.' The reluctance of academic and community

participants to participate in time-consuming projects that do not yield outputs that are directly beneficial (e.g. publications, funding, policy change) can challenge CCE brokers. When project partners feel overburdened by excessive meetings, participation and enthusiasm within community advisory committees has been found to decrease (Keating & Sjoquist 2000). Of note, just as community and academic partners interested in CCE struggle to find sufficient resources, brokers too are not immune to these challenges.

Despite the valuable insights generated in the literature thus far, limited documentation exists about the specific role CCE brokers play and ways they can establish and maintain more mutually beneficial partnerships. In response, we present an analytical framework to articulate the potential contributions of brokering initiatives to community-campus partnerships. We reflect on learnings from our review, highlight the opportunities and limitations of our analytical framework, and provide suggestions for future research and practice.

A review of community-campus brokering initiatives.

The purpose of this review was to examine a sample of brokering initiatives, evaluate the commonalities and differences, and gain a better understanding of their contributions to successful community-campus partnerships. The initial research for this article was completed as part of the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement Research partnership (CFICE; see <https://carleton.ca/>). We began by compiling a list of brokering initi-

atives through online searches of community organisations and academic institutions. Search terms included 'broker' and 'brokerage' by themselves and each combined with 'partnership', 'community-university partnership', 'community-campus partnership', 'community-based research', 'community-engaged research', and 'community-driven'. From our search, we selected brokering initiatives that fell within our broad definition presented in the introduction to this article. We shared an initial list with a number of academics and community-based practitioners involved in CCE work to ensure accuracy and identify additional brokering initiatives we may have missed. From our review, we selected a sample of 23 different brokering initiatives within Canada, the US and the UK. While the brokering initiatives we reviewed varied significantly, the key criterion for inclusion in this study was that each brokering initiative's mandate was to initiate and/or maintain partnerships between community and academic partners for the purpose of community-engaged teaching and research. For each initiative, we developed a profile, which included information gathered from websites and in some cases informal discussions with staff to obtain detailed descriptions of their work. Using cross-case analysis (Patton 2015), we categorised the information about each brokering initiative and established a classification system. After analysing the 23 brokering initiatives, we discontinued our search for new examples because we were no longer finding new information or codes to add to the dataset (Fusch & Ness 2015).

A framework for analysis

The brokering initiatives we reviewed revealed a range of services, focusing on a variety of partners and thematic areas. In considering the commonalities and differences, we identified variation in two key areas. First, from examining the different attributes by identifying affiliation, principle purpose and who received the primary benefit, and comparing this information, we generated five separate categories that delineate the basic structural allegiance of each brokering initiative: (1) community-based, (2) university-based, (3) community-university-based, (4) resource-based, and (5) brokering networks. Second, we classified brokering initiatives into four key dimensions that consider the kinds of activities being undertaken. These categories include (1) level of engagement, (2) type of platform, (3) scale of activities, and (4) area of focus. We then describe the categories within the analytical framework in which to situate different brokering initiatives. Following this description, we highlight ways this framework might be used to help inform decisions about the establishment, development and long-term sustainability of brokering initiatives.

Part 1: Structural Allegiance

Table 1 provides a description of each of the five categories of structural allegiance to indicate who CCE brokers are, what they do and the impact of their work, together with examples of the different brokering initiatives we reviewed.

Community-based brokering initiatives are rooted in communities and their primary purpose is to provide opportunities for community organisations to collaborate with academics and/or professional

researchers on projects that address community objectives. The initiatives we reviewed worked with individuals and organisations in the public, private and/or non-profit sectors to accomplish a range of tasks, such as defining research questions and developing proposals, making initial connections with potential academics and other research partners, managing community-driven research projects, and providing training and mentoring in community-based research for all participants involved. Brokers pay particular attention to each community's needs and work to ensure the community's priorities drive the project. Brokers work with partners to make sure knowledge is co-created and projects are action-oriented, meaning that partners can use findings to make positive changes within their communities. Brokers build the capacity of community partners and community members by collaboratively developing training opportunities and resources. Stakeholders often include staff members and volunteers from community-based organisations, community residents, marginalised groups, academic institutions and government ministries.

One example of a community-based brokering initiative is the Centre for Community Based Research (www.community.ca/).

Located in Waterloo, Canada, it is an independent non-profit organisation which aims to promote collaborative approaches to the co-production of knowledge and innovative solutions to community needs. The Centre is committed to social justice and employs community researchers with insider perspectives. It uses a participatory and action-oriented approach, bringing

people together with diverse expertise to contribute to positive community change. A second example is Vibrant Communities Canada (<http://www.vibrantcanada.ca/>) which engages a pan-Canadian audience to connect people, organisations, businesses and government to reduce poverty in Canada. Their efforts are community-driven and focus on supporting solutions to reducing poverty. Members connect through in-person events and online opportunities, including joining discussion groups or learning communities, contributing blog posts and searching member profiles.

University-based brokering initiatives typically aim to encourage the university population to engage in CCE through training, partnership matching, funding and ongoing support. These kinds of models may support initiatives such as science shops, service-learning courses, community-based research projects and community outreach services. Many of them also offer support for community-based organisations working with academics by providing a range of services such as facilitating initial connections and partnership development, and offering templates for partnership agreements, financial and human resources and troubleshooting on an ongoing basis. Academic institutions typically house and fund university-based brokers to meet institutional needs. While community partners play an important role in projects working with academic faculty or students, a key purpose of these brokering initiatives is to ensure academics have opportunities to conduct research and learn within community organizations.

The Community Engaged Scholarship Institute (www.cesinstitute.ca/) is one ex-

ample of a university-based brokering initiative. It is located in Guelph, Canada, and acts as a hub for engaged scholarship within the University of Guelph and the broader community. Staff members work with faculty members and students, community-based organizations and government, building capacity for participation in community engagement and social innovation projects. The Institute leverages resources, builds and maintains partnerships, and addresses obstacles to participating in community-engaged research. Another example is University-Community Partnerships (<http://ucp.msu.edu/>). Located in East Lansing, US, it provides a range of services for developing research networks among campus partners at Michigan State University and community partners. Staff match university partners interested in working with a community group or partner on a grant proposal or maintaining a long-term campus partnership with a community group. University-Community Partnerships balances university and community needs and priorities, promoting projects that provide mutual benefits for all partners, build capacity in communities and encourage long-term partnerships within research networks.

As a hybrid of the previous two categories, community-university-based brokering initiatives are often managed by a team of academic staff, students and/or faculty, as well as community-based organizational representatives. Initiatives in this category are typically driven by both community and academic partners, although it is common to see explicit reference towards prioritizing community objectives and goals. These types of brokering initiatives typically op-

erate using a mix of resources from postsecondary institutions and external grant funding.

An example of a community-university based brokering initiative is the Helpdesk of the Community University Partnership Programme

(www.brighton.ac.uk/), housed at the University of Brighton in the UK. The Helpdesk's work is community-driven and collaborative, with an emphasis on ensuring that community and academic partners are able to build equitable relationships and gain mutual benefit (Rodriguez & Millican 2007). It acts as a gateway to the university for both representatives from community-based organisations enquiring about funding for starting up a research project and faculty members who might have relevant research interest in collaborating on a project; and as a contact point for university staff and students interested in making contact with community-based organisations for collaborative research and teaching purposes. Initiated through philanthropic seed funding, the Helpdesk currently receives the majority of its funding through its university host. Another example is the Trent Community Research Centre (www.trentcentre.ca/) located in Peterborough, Canada. The Centre is community-based, with project proposals prioritizing community needs coming from community-based organizations. Brokers match Trent University students seeking to engage in community-based projects as volunteers or to fulfil part of their course work with community partners to conduct community-based research projects. They ensure that community partners' priorities

drive the project, as well as supporting the university students throughout the project.

Resource-based brokering initiatives include grant programs that provide resources to community-based organizations and academic researchers and/or institutions that aim to address key challenges through research and action. While some resource-based brokering initiatives simply provide monetary resources, others prefer to play a more active role in the partnership by taking on management responsibilities and/or offering extended support services such as training and knowledge mobilisation services. For example, the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada (http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/partnerships-partenariats/index-eng.aspx) offers a series of grant programs to support partnerships between academics at different universities, as well as between businesses and non-profit organizations. Funds are granted to carry out research, training and knowledge mobilization activities using approaches that involve partners collaborating and sharing leadership. Funds can be used to establish new partnerships, test partnership approaches and expand established partnerships. As a second example, the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (www.publicengagement.ac.uk/), located in Bristol, UK, supports universities throughout the UK to increase how often and how well they engage in community-based research and learning activities. It works with campus staff members and students to develop skills for community-engagement activities and offers training sessions (e.g. funding, impact, evaluation) and consultan-

cy to researchers, research managers and staff members in community-based organizations.

Finally, brokering networks, the broadest of the brokering initiative categories, describe initiatives that tend to operate independently to foster relationships through a series of mechanisms. With brokering networks taking on a range of formal and informal structures, they often require little commitment from members and minimal resources to sustain. Networks can also work across geographies to provide a channel for sharing information, resources and ideas (Ontario Health Communities Coalition n.d.). Brokering networks offer opportunities to develop partnerships, collaborate on projects and share information in a more indirect way than the other four structures.

The Community-Campus Partnerships for Health (www.ccphealth.org/) is a membership-based CCE network that provides numerous opportunities to promote and connect communities and academic institutions around health equity and social justice (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health 2017). Through their website, multiple listservs and biennial conference, the network mobilises knowledge, provides training and technical assistance, conducts research, builds coalitions and advocates for supportive policies. As a brokering network, it unites community practitioners and academics from diverse fields around community-based participatory research principles and practices. On the other hand, the Canadian Rural Research Network (<http://rural-research-network.blogspot.ca/>) acts as a hub for rural stakeholders across Canada, including

academics, practitioners, formal and informal community groups, and government officials, to share research outputs. Members can stay up-to-date on rural research, connect with various rural stakeholders, and develop and maintain research partnerships. The Network has no budget, but is sustained by its members who serve on various committees.

Part 2: Dimensions

The second part of the framework involves four categories that speak to the kinds of activities undertaken by brokering initiatives. These categories address details of what CCE brokers do and how they develop programs, governance and infrastructure accordingly. Below we present a description of each of the four categories as well as examples of some of the different kinds of brokering initiatives.

First, level of engagement covers the frequency of support and duration of involvement that brokers have with stakeholders throughout a CCE project. The level of engagement of the different brokering initiatives can be conceived of as a continuum that meets the needs of CCE partnerships in a variety of ways. At one end are brokering initiatives that provide 'light-touch' engagement, which often involves CCE brokers having initial contact with partners, being less involved after the partnership has been established, and allowing the partners to take on leadership. For example, some brokering initiatives we reviewed supported community-engaged learning projects by pairing students with community-based organisations to fulfil coursework requirements, identifying faculty members to work with a particular

community partner, and offering training sessions, one-time learning events, or meeting spaces to be used on an as needed basis. At the other end are brokering initiatives that offer a deep level of engagement. This involves establishing partnerships and playing an active role throughout the duration of the project by working with partners to manage and conduct community-driven research. The Trent Community Research Centre, for example, maintains contact with partners throughout the course of a project and sometimes beyond. These CCE brokers also engage in project-planning and decision-making, helping to secure project funding, and in the case of community-based research activities, playing a direct role in the research (e.g. data collection, analysis and interpretation, and knowledge mobilisation).

Second, brokering initiatives differed in respect of the types of platforms they used to manage services. Some brokering initiatives maintained a physical centre within an academic institution or an office in the community. Having a physical presence within a community or on campus allowed these types of brokering initiatives to host face-to-face meetings with community and university partners or make workspaces available for planning, data collection or informal discussions. Learning events, such as workshop series, presentation panels and informal meet-and-greets could also be used to bring community and academic partners together for face-to-face interaction. Other brokering initiatives, such as the Canadian Rural Research Network, used virtual platforms that offered community and academic partners the opportunity to connect through online com-

munication tools, such as discussion forums, listservs, researcher wanted boards, expertise or member profile searches, volunteer or partner matching databases, and virtual platforms for group collaboration. Some brokering initiatives offered a combination of physical and virtual platforms as multiple ways to connect diverse partners.

Third, brokering initiatives differed in their scale of activities. Some brokering initiatives were primarily focused on supporting partnerships in their local community or region. Examples include brokering partnerships between community groups and students to establish a food rescue program in a city, establishing connections with local housing providers and professors to develop innovative opportunities in a low-income neighbourhood, and working with local libraries to match university students with children in need of reading mentors. Other brokering initiatives reached a national audience. For example, establishing partnerships between rural researchers and practitioners across Canada, connecting diverse stakeholders to explore national poverty solutions, and bringing together community-based organisations and academics in the UK over issues of food security. Other brokering initiatives spanned a much wider geography, working with partners on an international scale. Examples include promoting an exchange of ideas and knowledge-sharing at international health and social justice conferences on community-based participatory research, implementing an international in-person community-campus partnerships course and follow-up mentoring, and promoting online global dialogue and resource-

sharing for students and community activists interested in social action and research.

Lastly, the areas of focus varied among the different brokering initiatives. Some initiatives engaged in particular issue-based activities and services. For example, a brokering initiative focusing on community food security hosted webinars and workshops, posted articles on their website and sent out newsletters to members. Other issue-based efforts covered poverty reduction, rural research, HIV/AIDS, and housing. In general, these activities tended to be more issue-based than those in the other brokering initiative categories. Some brokering initiatives had a much broader focus, however, with CCE brokers engaging in projects using community-engaged approaches to teaching and research, focusing on a broad range of issues and areas, such as community resilience and health promotion.

Upon examination of the four categories, level of broker engagement and types of broker platforms, appeared to be the most informative for developing a brokering initiatives matrix. Areas of focus tended to vary among the brokering initiatives and few patterns could be identified from that dimension. And while we noticed that brokering initiatives using virtual platforms tended to reach more national and international audiences, whereas physical platforms lent themselves to a local scale of activity, descriptions of activities within the level of broker engagement and type of broker platforms seemed most informative for guiding brokering initiatives. Figure 1 provides a summary of these two brokering initiative dimensions.

Broker initiative dimensions matrix

Brokering initiatives in the virtual-light touch quadrant offer opportunities to share knowledge and establish connections with a wide span of members or partners. The Canadian Rural Research Network (<http://rural-research-network.blogspot.ca/>) is one example of this type of approach. Some drawbacks to this approach include members engaging in passive interactions (e.g. scanning a blogpost), but not reaching out to members, and offering limited member contact by not promoting regular member or partner contact. Brokering initiatives in the virtual-deep engagement quadrant offer members more engaging opportunities to connect by promoting ongoing project sharing, regular meetings and frequent news updates. While this approach has great potential in deeply connecting diverse stakeholders, we did not come across this kind of brokering initiative in our search. Drawbacks to this approach could be the increased resources required within the brokering initiative to moderate discussions, host meetings, and provide regular coaching and member interaction. Brokering initiatives in the physical-light touch quadrant offer services to connect people within communities while requiring fewer resources to sustain a deep engagement initiative. The Helpdesk is an example of a brokering initiative that uses this approach. A drawback could be that partners might not be able to sustain engagement without a broker's ongoing support. Finally, the physical-deep engagement brokering initiative offers partners opportunities to deeply engage with one another throughout the life of a project. The Centre for Community-

Based Research is an example of this type of brokering initiative. Drawbacks include the resources, such as time, space and funds, necessary to support partners at each phase of a project.

Conclusions

In this article, we have presented an overview of the features, roles and activities of brokering initiatives and a framework to better understand their contributions to successful community-campus partnerships. Our intention has been to provide an analytical tool that can support academics and community-based practitioners engaged in teaching and research partnerships. There are a number of ways this framework might be used in developing new or existing brokering initiatives. First, the categories in each of the two parts of the framework describing the different structural allegiances (i.e. community-based brokering initiatives, university-based brokering initiatives, community-university-based brokering initiatives, resource-based brokering initiatives and brokering networks) and dimensions (i.e. levels of engagement, types of platforms, scales of activities and areas of focus) could encourage partners to think through their overall goals and objectives. The framework could also help participants to better evaluate the purpose of a brokering initiative and the various mechanisms to be used to meet those objectives. Further, it might enable consideration of the strengths and limitations of various brokering initiatives in order to understand what each might accomplish, its limitations, and how it could adapt accordingly.

For example, a CCE broker interested in disseminating knowledge, keeping participants up-to-date on activities and providing a place for input and sharing ideas might adopt a virtual light-touch engagement model. This type of model would require few resources to maintain (e.g. staff members, infrastructure, costs). A brokering initiative interested in regularly engaging a wide reach of partners or members, but at a low cost, might wish to use a virtual deep-engagement model. This could keep overheads low as only a few key staff members would be required to maintain online communication tools and activities (e.g. website, discussion moderation, web coaching, webinars). By contrast, a brokering initiative seeking to have a wide community impact by reaching many diverse partners might decide to use a physical light-touch model. By offering matching services, but not requiring resources to provide ongoing support to partnerships throughout a project, this type of initiative would require minimal staff members to review proposals and match partners. The most resource-intensive choice is the physical deep-engagement model. A brokering initiative with the goal of establishing and maintaining CCE partnerships and supporting partners long-term would need to ensure they had adequate, ongoing funding available to sustain such a model. As more CCE projects turn to brokering initiatives as a way to support their work, it is important that all partners have a clear sense of the initiative's purpose and what is involved.

The framework could also be used to consider where and how to situate a brokering initiative. For example, a brokering initiative based in the community would be

more accessible for community-based organizations and more understanding and responsive to their needs than if based in a university. This would be especially true if there was concern that a particular institutional structure might not address the needs of community participants in a meaningful way. However, university-based brokers might have more success securing funding and other resources to support their work. Universities could also facilitate broader based partnership networks, while many non-profit organizations would have limited capacity to build and maintain relationships beyond those related to their immediate work. With university funding, however, comes additional expectations (e.g. prioritizing faculty and students, adhering to a university's strategic plan). As another example, as brokering initiatives in a physical location are typically housed in community-based centers or university-based offices, they are well positioned to respond to their immediate community, an important element in building trust. Network brokers, on the other hand, tend to use virtual platforms, which limit face-to-face contact but allow them to reach a much wider constituency.

Brokering initiatives could also use this framework when mapping out the resources needed to sustain their work. Common to most brokering initiatives we examined was the importance of having a steady source of funding to develop infrastructure, hire staff to carry out the necessary tasks and sustain the initiative over the long-term. CCE brokers that are funded or based in a university tended to have the most stability and capacity as a result of solid institutional backing. In fact, some of

the brokering initiatives we studied began as independent organizations based in the community, but over time chose to relocate to the university due to funding opportunities and the institutional resources and supports available. Having stable funding appeared to lessen the anxiety of participants and allow CCE brokers to focus on improving the content of their activities and services. In a number of cases, added stability also enabled participants to more seriously consider and address power imbalances within their relationships. Some of the networks we examined, such as the Canadian Rural Research Network, did not have funding and, as a result, operated primarily as a shell, with activities driven completely by participants (typically those with grants to do their work). The source of funding also made a significant difference to the work CCE brokers could take on. For example, one brokering initiative reported that having support from an external funder over the course of several years allowed them to respond better to community needs, take risks and experiment with new types of activities rather than worrying about whether they were addressing the university's strategic plan. For many academics, a well-funded, secure and long-term partnership provided added legitimacy for engaging in, and in some cases leading, CCE projects.

We propose several directions for future research on CCE brokering initiatives. First, there is very little research documenting and evaluating case studies of brokering initiatives, especially in peer-reviewed journals. These kinds of scholarly studies are important as a means of sharing information and comparing and contrasting

the efforts of different initiatives. The framework is a first step towards that in-depth analysis and could be used to further examine the process of building and maintaining CCE brokering relationships and models. Second, limited research exists on both the factors for success and the challenges faced by CCE brokering initiatives. To share learning, we suggest that researchers analyse experiences and document lessons learned from attempts at brokering community-campus partnerships in relation to the categories proposed in this article. Finally, CCE practitioners would benefit from studies of the different tools available to support brokering initiatives. We propose that these tools could be conceptualized in relation to the framework.

While this framework provides a valuable tool for understanding and evaluating brokering initiatives, it is not intended to be static. In most cases, we found that the categories were not fixed and that many of the brokering initiatives we examined took on more than one of the structural allegiances and/or dimensions simultaneously. This speaks to the context in which many of these brokering initiatives operate (e.g. reacting/responding to changing funding realities, program priorities of community organisations, emerging/unanticipated needs, etc.). Also, as technology changes along with the needs of CCE, new tools are being developed that may require different kinds of frameworks to understand and interpret CCE activities. Thus, while we compared brokering initiatives in order to understand their different attributes, we are not advocating a standardised approach to evaluation. Our research and experience leads us to suggest that brokering

initiatives must be context-specific and respond to the needs of both community and academic partners. However, we need mechanisms to support community-campus partnerships in a more institutional and sustained way. It is our hope that the analytical framework will make a meaningful contribution to this endeavour.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance and support of the academics and practitioners involved in the Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement (CFICE) project. Specifically, we wish to acknowledge contributions made by Peter Andrée, Jason Garlough, Stephen Hill, John Marris, Natasha Pei, Amanda Sheedy, Elizabeth Whitmore and Amanda Wilson.

References

- Alcantara, L, Harper, G, Keys, C & The Adolescent Medicine Trials Network for HIV/AIDS Interventions 2015, “‘There’s gotta be some give and take’: Community partner perspectives on benefits and contributions associated with community partnerships for youth’, *Youth & Society*, vol. 47, no. 4: pp. 462–85. doi:10.1177/0044118X12468141
- Andrée, P, Chapman, D, Hawkins, L, Kneen, C, Martin, W, Muehlberger, C, Nelson, C, Pigott, K, Qaderi-Attayi, W, Scott, S & Stroink, M 2014, ‘Building effective relationships for community-engaged scholarship in Canadian food studies’, *Canadian Food Studies/La Revue canadienne des études sur l’alimentation*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 27–53. doi:10.15353/cfs-rcea.v1i1.19
- Andrée, P, Kepkiewicz, L, Levkoe, C, Brynne, A & Kneen, C 2016, ‘Learning, food and sustainability in community-campus engagement: Teaching and research partnerships that strengthen the food sovereignty movement’, in J Sumner (ed.), *Learning, food and sustainability: Sites for resistance and change*, Palgrave, New York, pp. 133–54.
- Baker, D 2006, ‘Ecological development through service-learning’, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 11, no. 1: pp. 145–59.
- Baquet, C 2012, ‘A model for bidirectional community-academic engagement (CAE): Overview of partnered research, capacity enhancement, systems transformation, and public trust in research’, *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, vol. 23, no. 4: pp. 1806–824. doi:10.1353/hpu.2012.0155
- Bell, H, Busch, N, Cook Heffron, L, White, B, Angelelli, M & Rivaux, S 2004, ‘Balancing power through community building: Researchers, survivors, and practitioners set the research agenda on domestic violence and sexual assault’, *Affilia*, vol. 19, pp. 404–17. doi:10.1177/0886109904268871
- Bortolin, K 2011, ‘Serving ourselves: How the discourse on community engagement privileges the university over the community’, *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 18, no. 1: pp. 49–58.
- Brown, L, Ochocka, J, de Grosbois, S & Hall, B 2015, ‘Kamúcwkalha: Canadian approaches to community-university research partnerships’, in B Hall, R Tandon & C Trem-

blay (eds), *Strengthening community university research partnerships: Global perspectives*, University of Victoria, British Columbia, BC, pp. 95–112.

Burke, J 2013, 'Making it better: The partnership broker's role in review and evaluation', *Betwixt and Between: The Journal of Partnership Brokering*, vol. 2.

Buys, N & Bursnall, S 2007, 'Establishing university–community partnerships: Processes and benefits', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 29, no. 1: pp. 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800601175797>

Calderón, J 2007, *Race, poverty, and social justice: Multidisciplinary perspectives through service learning*, Stylus Publishing, Sterling, VA.

Chen, Y-Y 2013, 'Partnership and performance of community-based organizations: A social network study of Taiwan', *Journal of Social Service Research*, vol. 39, iss. 5, pp. 690–703. doi:10.1080/01488376.2013.829164

Community Campus Partnerships for Health 2017, 'About us', viewed 2 February 2017, <https://ccph.memberclicks.net/about-us>

Cronley, C, Madden, E & Davis, J 2015, 'Making service-learning partnerships work: Listening and responding to community partners', *Journal of Community Practice*, vol. 23, no. 2: pp. 274–89. doi:10.1080/10705422.2015.1027801

Dempsey, S 2010, 'Critiquing community engagement', *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 3: pp. 359–90. doi:10.1177/0893318909352247

Dorow, S, Stack-Cutler, H & Varnhagen, S 2011, *Community perspectives on partnering with the University of Alberta: The 2009 survey of local Edmonton organizations*, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Evans, J & McClinton-Brown, R 2016, *Ensuring shared leadership in research through community advisory boards*, paper presented at the 2016 Community-Campus Partnerships for Health conference, New Orleans, LA, 11 May.

Fusch, P & Ness, L 2015, 'Are we there yet? Data saturation and qualitative research', *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 20, no. 9: pp. 1408–16.

Hart, A, Maddison, E & Wolff, W 2007 (eds), *Community-university partnerships in practice*, National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, England, UK.

Holliday, M, DeFalco, T & Sherman, J 2015, 'Putting impact first: Community-university partnerships to advance authentic neighborhood sustainability', *Metropolitan Universities*, vol. 26, no. 3: pp. 79–104.

Hundal, S 2013, 'Evaluating partnership broker approach: A methodological perspective', *Betwixt and Between: The Journal of Partnership Brokering*, vol. 2.

Ivery, J 2010, 'Partnerships in transition: Managing organizational and collaborative change', *Betwixt and Between: The Journal of Partnership Brokering*, vol. 20, no. 1: pp. 20–37. doi:10.1080/10911350903256648

Jaffe, P, Berman, H & MacQuarrie, B 2011, 'A Canadian model for building university and community partnerships: Centre for Research & Education on Violence Against Women and Children', *Violence Against Women*, vol. 17, no. 9: pp. 1159–75. doi:10.1177/1077801211419097

Keating, L & Sjoquist, D 2000, 'The use of an external organization to facilitate university-community partnerships', *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, vol. 5, pp. 141–57.

Keyte, L 2014, *Barriers and opportunities for community partners in community-campus partnerships: A research report*, Community First: Impacts of Community Engagement, Ottawa ON, Canada.

Lantz, P, Viruell-Fuentes, E, Israel, B, Softley, D & Guzman, R 2001, 'Can communities and academia work together on public health research? Evaluation results from a community-based participatory research partnership in Detroit', *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, vol. 78, no. 3: p. 495–507. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/78.3.495>

Levkoe, C, Andrée, P, Bhatt, V, Brynne, A, Davison, K, Kneen, C & Nelson, E 2016, 'Collaboration for transformation: Community-campus engagement for just and sustainable food systems', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 20, no. 3: pp. 32–61.

Levkoe, C, Brial, S & Danier A 2014, 'Engaged pedagogy and transformative learning in graduate education: A service-learning case study', *Canadian Journal of Higher Education/Revue canadienne d'enseignement supérieur*, vol. 44, no. 3: pp. 68–85.

Lindamer, L, Lebowitz, B, Hough, R, Garcia, P, Aguirre, A, Halpain, M, Depp, C & Jest, D 2009, 'Establishing an implementation network: Lessons learned from community-based participatory research', *Implementation Science*, vol. 4, no. 17. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-17

McNall, M, Reed, C, Brown, R & Allen, A 2009, 'Brokering community-university engagement', *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 33, p. 317–31. doi:10.1007/s10755-008-9086-8

Molnar, C, Ritz, T, Heller, B & Solecki, W 2010, 'Using higher education-community partnerships to promote urban sustainability', *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, vol. 53, no. 1: pp. 18–28. doi:10.1080/00139157.2011.539944

Mundy, J 2013, 'Progressive review and evaluation as a trust building mechanism in partnerships', *Betwixt and Between: The Journal of Partnership Brokering*, vol. 2.

Naqshbandi, M, Harris, S, Macaulay, A, Comeau, J, Piché, J & Montour-Lazare, D 2011, 'Lessons learned in using community-based participatory research to build a national diabetes collaborative in Canada', *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, vol. 5, no. 4: pp. 405–15.

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement 2016, 'Brokerage: Introduction', viewed 1 November 2016, <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/doi/techniquesapproaches/brokerage>

Ontario Health Communities Coalition n.d., 'Types of collaborations', viewed 6 February 2017, www.ohcc-ccso.ca/en/book/export/html/415

Partnership Brokers Association 2012, What do partnership brokers do? An enquiry into practice, viewed 1 May 2016, partnershipbrokers.org/w/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/What-do-Partnership-Broker-Do

Partnership Brokers Association 2016, 'Partnership broker roles and skills', viewed 7 May 2016, partnershipbrokers.org/w/brokering/roles-and-skills/

Patton, M 2015, *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, 4th edn, Sage, Los Angeles, CA.

Pauzé, E & Level 8 Leadership Institute 2013, Partnership governance resource, viewed 7 May 2016, www.valuebasedpartnerships.com

Petri, A 2015, 'Service-learning from the perspective of community organizations', *Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education*, vol. 5, pp. 93–110.

Phipps, D, Johnny, M & Wedlock, J 2015, 'An institutional process for brokering community-campus research collaborations', *Engaged Scholar Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 69–86. doi:10.15402/esj.v1i1.39

Rodriguez, P & Millican, J 2007, 'Community-university research engagement: The Cupp research Helpdesk', in A Hart, E Maddison & D Wolff (eds), *Community-university partnerships in practice*, pp. 32–40. National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, England, UK.

Sandy, M & Holland, B 2006, 'Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 13, no. 1: pp. 30–43.

Schwartz, K, Weaver, L, Pei, N & Miller, A 2016, 'Community-campus partnerships, collective impact, and poverty reduction', *Community Development*, vol. 47, no. 2: pp. 167–80. doi:10.1080/15575330.2015.1128955

Stiegman, M & Castleden, H 2015, 'Leashes and lies: Navigating the colonial tensions of institutional ethics of research involving indigenous peoples in Canada', *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, vol. 6, no. 3. doi:10.18584/iipj.2015.6.3.2

Tennyson, R 2005, *The brokering guidebook: Navigating effective sustainable development partnerships*, The International Business Leaders Forum, England, viewed 18 April 2017, <http://thepartneringinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/TheBrokeringGuidebook.pdf>

Tennyson, R 2014, 'New mechanisms for brokering collaboration: The emergence of partnership brokering units and organisations', *Betwixt and Between: The Journal of Partnership Brokering*, vol. 3.

Tennyson, R & Baksi, B 2016, Appointing a partnership broker, viewed 30 April 2017, <http://partnershipbrokers.org/w/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Appointing-a-Partnership-Broker-Feb-2016sm.pdf>

Tryon, E & Ross, J 2012, 'A community-university exchange project modeled after Europe's science shops', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 16, no. 2: pp. 197–211.

Tryon, E & Stoecker, R 2008, 'The unheard voices: Community organizations and service-learning', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 12, no. 3: pp. 47–59.

Van Devanter, N, Kwon, S, Sim, S-C, Chun, K, B Free CEED Coalition & Trinh-Shevrin, C 2011, 'Evaluation on community-academic partnership functioning: Center for the Elimination of Hepatitis B Health Disparities', *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, vol. 5, pp. 223–33. doi:10.1353/cpr.2011.0032

Ward, K & Wolf-Wendel, L 2000, 'Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 43, no. 5: pp. 767–780. doi:10.1177/00027640021955586

Exploring Learning of Community Study

Hartej Gill

University of Victoria,
A302 - 3800 Finnerty Road, Victoria, V8P 5C2, Canada

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/jpapyr80v11i1.5439>

Abstract

Community-based research (CBR) is a relatively new methodology characterised by the co-generation of knowledge. As CBR is integrated into institutional frameworks, it becomes increasingly important to understand what differentiates CBR from other research. To date, there has been no systematic study of CBR values and principles, which tend to be offered as a list of considerations that are taken as given rather than problematised. Similarly, research has not explored the ways in which understandings of CBR's underlying values differ among individual researchers compared to the broader research values of a large university. In this article, we report the findings of a Delphi study which addresses these gaps through a systematic, cross-disciplinary survey of CBR researchers at a large Canadian research university. Our findings indicate diverse and complex understandings of both the potentially political nature of CBR and the perceived values of the respondents' institution.

Keywords: *community-based research, participatory research, Delphi, research ethics, participatory action research, CBPR*

Introduction

In standard research practice, the scientific obligation to objectivity distances the researcher, as a legitimate producer of knowledge, from the researched, who neither influence the findings nor collaborate in the research process. In response, the past 20 years have witnessed the emergence of participatory approaches that seek to reduce the distance between researchers and the 'subjects' of research by engaging

directly with local stakeholders. Community-based research (CBR) is a relatively new methodology often aligned with critical theory and characterised by co-generation of knowledge and shared decision-making between researchers and community members. As such, CBR may challenge traditional ways of 'doing research'. Supporting CBR has increasingly become a strategic priority for universities due to its potential to enhance research impact (Hall 2009;

Speer & Christens 2013). As CBR is integrated into institutional frameworks and a growing number of researchers incorporate CBR into their research practice, it becomes increasingly important to understand CBR research principles and values.

However, the idea of CBR itself can be contestable. In this article, we use CBR as an umbrella term for research that involves community engagement. Other terms that may fall under this umbrella include action research, participatory action research, community-based participatory research, community-based participatory action research, peer research, (community) engaged research, and inclusion research. In some fields, such as health sciences, it is important to distinguish between CBR, which indicates that research takes place in the community, as opposed to the laboratory, clinic or hospital, and community-based participatory research, in which the community plays an equitable role in every phase of the research (Blumenthal 2011).

Within the literature, scholars have unpacked the terminology frequently associated with CBR, including action (Reid, Tom & Frisby 2006), participation (Cornwall 2008), community (Ross et al. 2010), engagement (Flicker et al. 2008), research (Wells & Jones 2009), peer (Roche, Flicker & Guta 2010) and inclusion (OWHN 2009). Scholarship has investigated methods of knowledge dissemination (Chen et al. 2010), levels of engagement (Flicker et al. 2008) and relationships with institutional ethics review boards (Shore et al. 2011). However, to date there has been no systematic study of CBR values and principles guiding the research process or of how the application of CBR principles

differs across academic researchers and community partners in various disciplines in one large university institution. Often, CBR values and principles are provided as a list of ethical considerations that are taken as given rather than negotiated by those directly involved in the research process. Moreover, the means by which particular principles or values are identified is not explained, or is done descriptively, usually by narrating research processes. Similarly, research has not yet explored the ways in which understandings of CBR's underlying values differ with respect to the faculty member's own research compared to the broader research values of a large university with many faculties and departments which may hold rigid ideas of what counts as 'real research'.

In order to address these gaps, our purpose for this study was to provide a forum for discussion of CBR values and principles (VPs) across disciplines for both faculty and community partners. In this article, we report the findings of a systematic cross-disciplinary survey of CBR researchers and community partners at a large Canadian research university. We also explore some common understandings of CBR's defining values and principles among different groups of stakeholders engaged in community-based research. Through the Delphi approach, this study generated a set of community-based research VPs. However, the findings also uncovered diverse and complex understandings among the respondents of the potentially 'political' nature of CBR. We highlight the complexity of defining VPs of CBR in one institution, given the issues of relationality and power reflected in the study.

Literature review

The major themes in the literature on CBR values and principles may be grouped under three broad, interconnected concerns: relationships, power and social change. Relationships refer to the multifaceted relations among community members engaging in research, the community organisations representing community members, university researchers and their institution. Power denotes access and control over resources, data and decision-making as well as over the definition of legitimate academic knowledge production. Social change references the desire of many CBR researchers to better the living conditions of research participants or provide support and capacity-building for greater equity and justice. We explore these issues in more detail below.

Relationships

Most authors agree that the relationship between the researcher and the researched is central to CBR. Accountability, trust, reciprocity, respect, solidarity and collaboration are frequently mentioned in the literature; moreover, for CBR scholars, relationships are part of a process that is at least as important as scholarly outcomes such as publications (Brydon-Miller 2009; Elliott 2012; Israel 2008; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008). Several scholars suggest that CBR partners must commit to long-term research relationships and emphasise the iterative nature of the CBR process (CAMH 2011; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009). Drawing on Kirkness and Barnhardt's (2001) earlier work, Stanton (2014) proposes that CBR should adhere to

the 'four Rs' of respect, relevance, reciprocity and responsibility. CBR researchers also stress the importance of open and inclusive processes and acknowledgement of one's social location (Brydon-Miller 2009; Cochran et al. 2008).

Stanton (2014) examines the potential for CBR to disrupt mainstream research paradigms that privilege 'individual merit', hierarchical prestige, methodological and discursive norms, and work that culminates in publication, to instead value the lived experiences of individuals and communities and ensure dissemination of knowledge gained to all partners. In this sense, CBR blurs the line between the researcher and the researched by recognising research participants as active 'subjects' rather than passive 'objects;' everyone is an expert (OWHN 2009). For example, St Denis (1992) argues that CBR is for and with rather than about or on research participants.

CBR's focus on relationships and accountability creates an affinity with Indigenous research methodologies. As in CBR, Indigenous researchers develop relationships in order to seek knowledge (Wilson 2008). Relationality in Indigenous research is not concerned so much with statistical significance or validity, but rather with accountability to relationships; this requires an unsettling of binaries such as knower/known and subject/object (Wilson 2008). Cautioning that, from the vantage point of the colonised, 'research' has been, and for the most part continues to be, a tool of imperialism and colonialism, Smith (2012) affirms 'research' to be one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary, and sets an agenda for research

that takes seriously Indigenous ways of knowing and being by posing a series of questions similar to those asked by CBR researchers. These include 'Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed its questions and framed its scope? Who will carry it out? Who will write it up? How will the results be disseminated?' (p. 10; see also Flicker, Roche & Guta 2010; Minkler 2004; OWHN 2009). In these contexts, CBR may go some way to addressing conflict between the Western values of the academic setting and those of marginalised and Indigenous communities (Cochran et al. 2008).

Power

In conventional research methodology, the 'objects' of research provide data which the researcher ('subject') analyses and owns. Conversely, many CBR scholars share the objective of creating equity in research relationships through attention to social inequities and shared ownership of the project, and findings for the benefit of all partners (Heffner, Zandee & Schwander 2003; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008). Breaking down traditional understandings of research subjects and objects through partnerships based on shared ownership implies disrupting existing power relations. For example, Cochran et al. (2008) argue that conventional research has perpetuated a myth that Indigenous people represent a 'problem' to be examined and solved and that they are passive 'objects' requiring assistance from outside experts. CBR responds to the limitations of traditional research approaches by acknowledging different ways of knowing, valuing the voices

of community residents and generating knowledge that meaningfully addresses locally identified problems (Fletcher 2003; Jacobson & Rugeley 2007).

Generating equity in relationships means CBR must challenge power explicitly (Elliott 2012; OWHN 2009). Accordingly, most writing on CBR begins with an assumption that CBR is more openly political (in the sense of naming and unsettling relationships of power) than conventional research aimed at objectivity. For example, Brydon-Miller and Maguire (2009, p. 79) suggest CBR is an 'unapologetically political approach to knowledge creation through and for action'. For many authors, ethics and empowerment are two key pillars of CBR (Blumenthal 2011; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012; Israel et al. 2001; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008; Minkler 2004). Building on these ideas, some scholars insist on the importance of anti-oppression principles and an acknowledgement that research is not value free, arguing that claims to objectivity have been used to subordinate research participants (CAMH 2011; OWHN 2009; Savan et al. 2009; Schwartz & van de Sande 2011). CBR scholars assert that CBR is a response to conventional research that has failed to protect or benefit participants and directly or indirectly led to significant harm (Wells & Jones 2009).

Because of CBR's explicit attention to power relations, some critics contend that CBR is unscientific, overly political and susceptible to bias, that community interests supersede theoretical and scientific rigour, and that it constitutes activism rather than research (Hernández 2015; McAreavey & Muir 2011; Ochocka and Janzen 2014). In other words, scholars have identified a per-

ceived tension between the values of scientific rigour and those of community participation (Elliott 2012; Minkler 2004). However, advocates argue that CBR has greater potential for meeting the standards of scientific knowledge creation than conventional social science precisely because researchers are engaged directly in the transformation of the phenomena they study (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood & Maguire 2003). Similarly, feminists have long pointed to the value of acknowledging the situated nature of knowledge (Haraway 1988).

Social Change

Following from the focus on power relations, several authors suggest that a key principle of CBR involves the integration of knowledge and action for social change, with the objective of transforming fundamental structures that sustain inequalities in order to improve the lives of those involved, as they define improvement (Brydon - Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012; Jacklin & Kinoshameg 2008; OWHN 2009; Stanton 2014). For Ross et al. (2010), social justice is a goal of CBR that includes ensuring research priorities respect the needs of marginalised communities and promote self-determination. Similarly, St Denis (1992) argues that CBR must be committed to critiquing the status quo and building a more just society.

As part of promoting positive social change, many authors stress the commitment of CBR researchers to capacity-building, co-learning, and expansion of critical consciousness (Brydon-Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer 2009; OWHN 2009;

Stanton 2014; Stoudt, Fox & Fine 2012). For example, Freudenberg and Tsui (2014) argue that improvements in health equity requires addressing the social determinants of health; consequently, policy change becomes a public health goal. Power dynamics are woven throughout policy efforts to improve health, and the work of public health researchers is inherently political because it concerns power relations (Freudenberg & Tsui 2014).

In sum, the literature reveals CBR as an ethical research practice that calls for researchers to be reflexive throughout the research process, leading to social transformation. Although the literature speaks to the values and principles of CBR, they have not been clearly articulated. To address this gap, we conducted a Delphi study among active CBR researchers at a research university in Western Canada.

Methodology

The university in which we conducted this study piloted a CBR initiative a few years ago. A steering committee under the Vice-President Research was set up to increase the visibility of CBR and promote the adoption of best practice at the university. Despite the fact that CBR is widely practised on campus, there has been a concern among CBR researchers that they are disadvantaged in research ethics reviews and tenure and promotion processes by the lack of understanding of the values and principles (VPs) of CBR. To address this concern, we conducted this study to generate a list of VPs that could be used as reference for these reviews and processes.

As a comprehensive research university with over 5000 research faculty members, CBR researchers come from a variety

of disciplines, each of which has its own research tradition, stakeholders and understanding of CBR. It is therefore difficult to identify all CBR researchers. Besides, the very essence of CBR entails the participation of community partners; therefore, it was also important that we involve their voices in a study to explore the values and principles of CBR. The actual number and identification of all community partners involved in CBR with this university was hard to determine. Thus, it was technically difficult to generate a frame for sampling via a traditional survey method.

Since broad generalisation was not our goal, we decided to employ the Delphi technique developed by the RAND Corporation in the 1950s (Dalkey 1967) to conduct this study. The Delphi method is a popular approach widely used in different fields to generate agreement through synthesis of a diverse range of expert opinions (Hasson, Keeney & McKenna 2000; Yan & Tsang 2005). As a research tool, Delphi depends on group dynamics rather than statistical authority to achieve consensus among experts (Okoli & Pawlowski 2004). It is a systematic, multiple-step process to solicit and collect information from respondents who are experts in a subject area. The design of a Delphi study is flexible and responsive to the actual data collection process. The number of rounds of data collection is contingent on the emergence of consensus which, although mainly based on majority view, is achieved without respondents feeling they are being judged (Geist 2010). Delphi also allows respondents to respond to emerging ideas during the research process in a time-effective manner (Tersine & Riggs 1976). In the ab-

sence of a face-to-face group discussion, respondents can express and exchange ideas freely in a confidential and anonymous fashion (Okoli & Pawlowski 2004).

Respondents

Following the Delphi tradition, respondents in our study were presumed to be experts in community-based research. Prior to this study, the Steering Committee organised several events to promote CBR on campus. An email list of approximately 200 CBR research practitioners was compiled. Phone, email and in-person invitations to take part in the study were sent to all registered researchers. We also invited people on the list to refer to us other CBR researchers who might be interested in participating, and an email was sent to all university Deans with a request to forward the invitation to members of their faculties who may have been actively involved in CBR. We also invited researchers who confirmed their participation to recommend at least one of their community partners take part in this study. A total of 106 people, including 50 faculty researchers, 37 community partners and 19 staff, who are research staff supporting and working on CBR research projects conducted by faculty researchers, were finally confirmed. They were invited to participate in three rounds of data collection, which were to take place from April to July 2015. Generally, Delphi prefers a stable and small group of respondents throughout the process. However, as it was difficult to monitor this large group of respondents, particularly when their participation was anonymous due to a requirement of the institutional ethics review protocol, ultimately only 70 of the 106

(66 per cent) confirmed participants took part in the first round of the survey. Attrition rate in Round 2 was 38.6 per cent and in Round 3, 48.6 per cent. Despite this, as noted in Table 1, there was a fair representation from faculty, community partners and staff in all three rounds. However, due to the small sample and the purpose of the study, we did not compare the answers from these three groups of respondents.

Procedures

The Delphi method is a stepwise process. The first step involved creating a draft list of values and principles. Based on an extensive literature review, which included records generated from previous CBR activities organised by the Steering Committee, 13 major categories (see Table 2) with a total of 150 itemised VPs were generated. The list was reviewed and discussed by a working group which had been set up to advise the Steering Committee on ethical issues related to CBR. Minor adjustments were made based on the discussion. In view of the diverse terminologies used by researchers from different disciplines across the campus, the working group also recommended not to provide an operational definition of CBR in order to allow respondents to describe their practice in an open-ended way. An online survey tool was employed in the three rounds of data collection.

Note: The number of items eliminated in the first round of the survey based on the cut-off point (discussed below) appears in brackets.

The aim of the first round of the survey was to refine a list of VPs for community-based research rooted in the experiences of

the researchers and community members involved in the study. This list then formed the basis of subsequent rounds of Delphi. Respondents were asked to indicate whether each category, and its itemised values and principles, was significant for their CBR practice and therefore could remain on the list in subsequent rounds. A comment box was provided under each VP for additional comments. The final question asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. Forty-three respondents provided a total of 252 comments in the first section, and 52 respondents provided descriptions of their CBR practice.

Delphi generates consensus largely and arbitrarily based on a majority rule. However, determining a reasonable cut-off point for sufficient consensus can be controversial (Yan & Tsang 2005). According to the literature, the minimum cut-off is 51 per cent, and some Delphi studies employ up to 80 per cent. Following completion of Round 1, a workshop was held to discuss the desirable cut-off point. All survey participants were invited. Twelve people attended the workshop (five faculty members, three staff, three community partners and the project RA). Following previous Delphi studies reported in the literature, attendees at the workshop decided to adopt a two-third majority rule, i.e. 67 per cent, as the cut-off point; the same figure was used for the Round 2 and 3 surveys. Although the 67 per cent cut-off was in fact arbitrary, it was considered by workshop attendees to represent a reasonable figure that was neither too restrictive nor too open. In Round 1, respondents were asked to select items from the provided list of VPs. VPs chosen by two-thirds or more of

respondents were included. In Rounds 2 and 3, the Delphi survey questions were about importance and relevance as they perceived them. Answers were arranged on a Likert scale from 1 (least) to 5 (most). Only VP items for which two-thirds or more of respondents checked '4' or '5' were retained. As a result, the total number of itemised VPs was reduced to 88 from 150. Workshop attendees and the study researchers also discussed rewording some VP categories and itemised values and principles, for example, 'Participation' became 'Equitable participation'. Further, since only one itemised principle under 'Transformation of fundamental structures' passed the cut-off, it was decided that we would eliminate this category and move the remaining item to the category of 'Long-term relationship', where it was more appropriately located.

The Round 2 survey had two parts. In the first part, the central question concerned the relevance of the remaining itemised VPs in each category. Specifically, we asked, 'On a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being "most relevant") how relevant is this itemized VP to: a) your CBR practice? b) the university?' Each section included a space for respondents to share additional comments. Part 2 was an optional question that asked whether any of the VPs or refined meanings that had fallen below the 67 per cent cut-off in Round 1 were crucial to respondents' research.

Round 3 focused on the importance of the 12 remaining VP categories. Respondents were asked, 'On a scale of 1–5 (with 5 being "most important") how important is this VP to a) your CBR practice? b) the university?' Each section included a comment

box for respondents to share additional comments. Since the intention of this round of the survey was to prioritise these 12 categories based on their importance, no cut-off point was used. Instead, totals were derived from the sum of the percentage of respondents who indicated the importance to be either four or five.

At the end of the Round 3 survey, we provided an opportunity for respondents to share their thoughts on possible uses of the results from this study as well as any other comments they wished to share. Twenty people provided a total of 23 comments.

Limitations

This study has its limitations. It was hard to provide a universally accepted definition of such a heavily laden term as CBR. By not providing an operational definition, we were able to include diverse opinions, but the respondents might have answered the questions from different or even contradictory perspectives. Due to the nature of the research design, we were not able to compare these diverse perspectives in the answers of the three major stakeholder groups. Further, the Delphi method is meant to solicit opinions from a group of experts through a methodologically 'neutral' medium, a survey in this case. However, the 'majority rule' in determining criteria unexpectedly raised some of the same political challenges that many CBR researchers have already experienced with regard to their CBR practice vis-a-vis the university and their departmental colleagues, in that some respondents found some of the VPs most important to them were not held in the same regard by other respondents and therefore not included in the final list.

Findings

Throughout the Delphi exercise process, we did not define CBR for respondents. Instead, in Round 1, we deliberately asked respondents to describe their CBR practice. The descriptions that we received set the context for understanding the Delphi results. According to the descriptions provided, respondents' research practices involved an extensive range of types and intensity of collaboration with community partners/researchers. Specific methods also varied widely and included both qualitative and quantitative methods. For some respondents, CBR starts with community needs, and the research questions, methods and actions taken are defined by community members. For other respondents, research questions and methods originate from the researcher and there is no expectation that action will be taken on the findings.

Dichotomised Views

Some respondents acknowledged that addressing power relations was important but resisted the characterisation of such efforts as 'political'. For example, one participant stated:

The research itself need not be (perhaps, should not be) political or politically motivated...However, the issue of power relationships between researchers, community groups and community members is important and must be consciously and overtly addressed.

Others found descriptors such as 'anti-oppressive' and 'empowering' to be too negative and/or pathologising, preferring more positive framings, e.g. 'social justice'. The controversy around the political nature

of CBR was well reflected in participants' narratives, particularly regarding the adherence to Indigenous epistemologies and anti-racist, anti-oppressive, and anti-colonial or decolonising perspectives.

For some respondents, these overtly politicised perspectives were critical to their work. As one participant aptly noted:

With the dropping of the above VPs [related to these perspectives], academic researchers maintain their privileged ability to define, design, and implement...Ideally we should all be aiming to protect the most vulnerable and be committed to praxis that contributes to decolonizing and anti-oppressive methodologies and theoretical frameworks.

Through the process, we also heard a strong voice from a few respondents who repeatedly pointed out the relevance of Indigenous and anti-colonial frameworks to CBR. For example, one respondent stated in the second round:

I feel strongly that the values related to Indigenous and anti-colonial frameworks need to be included, otherwise we will continue to conduct research that is colonial and creates harm. I am not sure how many Indigenous communities or partners participated in the first round, but it might be important to offer this again if the N is low.

However, not all participants agreed that CBR is always conducted with marginalised groups or that all ways of knowing should be respected. For example, as one participant suggested, 'Community collaborative research is not always about isms and oppression.'

These dichotomised views were also evident in the results of the survey. Indeed, as reflected in the narrative data, we can

see a divergent perspective on the ‘political’ nature of CBR (Table 3). The two VP categories, ‘Addressing power relations’ and ‘Transformation of fundamental structures’, which were perceived by some respondents as ‘political’, were trimmed down significantly in terms of the number of itemised VPs and, in the latter case, removed entirely. As indicated above, many of the more overtly political itemised VPs did not reach a majority consensus in the first round of the survey; for instance, ‘Problematizes systematic relations of power in the social construction of knowledge’ (44 per cent), ‘Based on an anti-oppression framework’ (41 per cent) and ‘Fundamentally challenges the structures of oppression’ (54 per cent).

The question of whether ‘action’ is an objective of CBR also provoked disagreement (Table 4). While a number of respondents characterised their research as ‘community-based participatory action research’, others did not suggest any action after the research, if at all. Related to this question, participants also varied in their perspectives on whether CBR questioned the status quo. For example, one commented, ‘Sometimes the status quo is not that bad.’

Values and Principles

A central purpose of this study was to generate a list of VPs that different stakeholders could use as a reference for research ethics applications, tenure and promotion reviews, and formal collaboration agreements (readers who would like to view the complete list of itemised VPs should contact the lead author). However, when formulating this study, we were re-

minded at the outset that CBR researchers have frequently perceived discrepancies between the research values that are important to them as individual researchers and the priorities of the university as an institutional collective. Therefore, in both Rounds 2 and 3 we asked respondents to rank the relevance and importance of VPs for both their own CBR practice and that of the university community. The discrepancy between individual and institutional research values is indeed reflected in our findings.

RELEVANCE OF ITEMISED VPS

As reflected in the list, respondents place great emphasis on a few key VPs that have been discussed in the literature, such as dialogue, togetherness, reciprocity, respect for local knowledge, accountability to the community, and the importance of iterative processes, to name a few. However, our findings also show that the respondents hold different perspectives in terms of the relevance of the VPs to their own CBR practice versus the practice of the university as an institution. In Table 5, we summarise the number of itemised VPs relevant to both respondents.

Looking into each VP category, we notice that, with one exception, most itemised VPs within the categories that are perceived to be relevant to the institution are also on the top of the list for researchers’ own CBR practice. For example, respondents placed significant emphasis on ‘Accountability’ for both their own CBR practice and the practice of the institutional community as a whole. Most researchers suggested that, in terms of their own practice, accountability was primarily to their

community partners. The excepted item was 'Researchers are accountable to the university' in the category of 'Accountability'. While 74.4 per cent of respondents perceived this principle to be relevant or very relevant to the institution, it did not pass the cut-off point for respondents' own CBR practice. Several participants also emphasised that researchers were accountable to outside funders; as one stated, 'In the excitement to collaborate we sometimes forget who is the funder and it is the funder who ultimately pulls the strings.'

Although there are two VPs ('Equitable participation' and 'Self-determination') for which respondents indicated equal numbers of itemised VPs as relevant to both their research and that of the university as an institution, there are major differences in most categories. The greatest differences were in the categories of 'Reciprocity' and 'Reflexivity'. Filtered by the cut-off point (67 per cent), 67 out of the 88 itemised VPs included in the survey were thought to be relevant or very relevant to respondents' own CBR practice and only 33 to the practice of the institution.

Importance of VP Categories

Many VPs inform CBR practice; however, not all bear the same importance. In Round 3 of the survey, we asked respondents to rank the perceived importance of the 11 VP categories to their own CBR practice and that of the institution. Comparing the percentage ranking of importance for almost all VP categories, respondents tended to assign a lower importance to the work of the institution than to their own work (Table 6). 'Collaboration/partnership' and 'Accountability' topped both lists, albe-

it in different order. To illustrate, one participant asserted: 'CBR respects diverse epistemologies and ontologies'; another stated, 'All who are actively involved in the research are accountable to each other and to an ethical research process'. The difference in perceived importance was greatest for 'Equitable participation', 'Empowerment' and 'Self-determination'. These differences may reflect many CBR researchers' uncertainty about the extent to which the university, as an institution, respects and supports their CBR work. As suggested by one respondent:

I believe as an organization [our university] is most interested in outcomes rather [than process]. This stems from the discourse about research (and other) excellence wherein funding dollars, prestige and numbers of publications still appear to be valued most highly.

Next, we present our reflections on the findings outlined above and suggest some implications for CBR researchers.

Discussion and implications

Our findings indicate that researchers engaging in CBR have diverse understandings of the nature of CBR. Despite this diversity, the findings show some consensus among respondents on VPs that are central to the practice of CBR. The final list of itemised VPs may fill a gap in the literature. Here, we highlight a few observations on the discrepancies we identified with respect to participants' perspectives on relationships, power and action for social change. We then interweave these observations with reflections on the Delphi research process, especially with regard to the political nature of CBR.

The Ethics of CBR

As shown in the literature, CBR is a value-driven research approach. However, while there was broad agreement on the importance of trust, respect, collaboration, partnership and dialogue across disciplines, each CBR researcher tended to adhere to different VPs.

Values and principles related to Indigeneity raised some concerns among participants. Research is viewed negatively by many members of Indigenous groups because it has been used as a tool of exploitation and colonialism (Smith 2012). Some researchers see CBR as a potential means of overcoming these issues and addressing past harms, but it is not possible to simply insert an Indigenous worldview into the dominant research paradigm, which is based on the belief that knowledge is an individual entity. Conversely, Indigenous paradigms arise from the fundamental belief that knowledge is relational and experiential (Wilson 2008). These ideas raise the question of what it means to take Indigenous worldviews seriously when some researchers do not see decolonisation as a meaningful research objective. There was a sense among some respondents that anti-colonial frameworks and respect for Indigenous epistemologies were only relevant when Indigenous people were directly involved in the research. From a decolonial perspective, this is problematic as we are all (settlers and Indigenous) negatively affected by colonial structures and, arguably, collectively share responsibility to address these structures in society.

Participants pointed to the importance of respecting diverse ontologies and epistemologies, but also emphasised that not all worldviews should be respected (e.g. Na-

zism). Still, most participants agreed that CBR is an 'ethical research practice'. Although 'ethical' was not defined precisely, such comments seem to imply that not all research is or has been ethical, a point which is also made strongly in the literature (e.g. Smith 2012). The high ranking accorded collaboration/partnership in the survey is consistent with the major discussion in the literature, reflecting the nature of CBR as a collaborative project (Brydon-Miller & Maguire 2009; CAMH 2011; Elliott 2012). Indeed, this is the VP that was least contested. In other words, there was a lot of agreement on the means (collaboration) and less on the ends (e.g. decolonisation, production of new knowledge) of CBR, and also whether power relations should form a consideration. Questions were also raised about the nature of the relationship in terms of whether solidarity was a desirable element. It is somewhat surprising to us that many researchers who are engaged in collaborative partnerships with community partners resisted characterisation of their research as 'political', when equitable inclusion (which all respondents acknowledged as important) is an overtly political intervention that challenges university hierarchies of knowledge production (Stanton 2014). On the other hand, if CBR is being conducted with powerful groups who hold reprehensible worldviews, ensuring equitable inclusion may be problematic for researchers committed to both CBR and social justice.

While we are cognisant that the final list of VPs is a result of consensus based on the majority rule, i.e. an artificial cut-off point, it has provided a common base from which CBR researchers can engage in dia-

logue among themselves as well as with their stakeholders, particularly the university administration. The following observations may be useful for CBR researchers who have to negotiate their work constantly with their affiliated institution. It is not uncommon to hear CBR researchers complain that their work is not treasured, particularly under the current neo-liberal managerial atmosphere of the academic setting.

First, in terms of importance, respondents proposed a similar ranking of the categorical VPs for both their own CBR practice and their expectation of their institutions. However, 67 VPs were considered to be relevant or very relevant to respondents' own CBR practice compared to 33 for the institution; among the 33 itemised VPs deemed relevant to the university community, eight (24 per cent) concern 'Accountability'. In other words, there is a perception that the institution is concerned most with accountability and publications and less with relationship building, which accords with the broader neoliberal context. CBR researchers, even those who resist the characterisation of CBR as political, seem to want to insert ethical considerations into research processes, while the university is more concerned with measurable outcomes in terms of publications. Finally, principles such as 'Values process and outcomes', 'Long-term relationships' and 'Reflexivity' seem to matter to respondents' own practice more than to that of the university as an institution. This may reflect respondents' perception of the administrative emphasis of the university as an institutional organisation or a cynical attitude on the part of researchers who feel their

research is not held in high regard by their institution. Indeed, it is this perceived lack of regard that lay behind the creation of the CBR initiative at the university in question.

The Politics of CBR

Questions of power are inherently political because, in broad terms, politics concerns the distribution of power and resources in society. Coming from social work, education and geography disciplinary backgrounds, we had understood CBR and indeed all research to be 'political'. However, some of the responses we received to the survey reveal that this is not the view of all CBR researchers. Here we explore the implications of respondents' differing perspectives on equality/equity, anti-oppression and objectivity.

It became evident early in the study that, when we tried to define CBR, many tensions emerged amongst faculty members in various disciplines, between those doing more quantitative research than qualitative research, and between faculty and community members and researchers and their institution. Interestingly, the main tensions seemed to be rooted in the epistemological, ontological and axiological positions of the respondents, which were closely tied to their discipline and institutional context. This was further complicated by the reality that, despite our efforts as researchers to be as inclusive as possible through various recruitment methods, including institution-wide invitations, faculty-wide invitations and personal invitations, our participants were inevitably only partially representative of the faculty, staff and university community. The absence of many voices led us to question the ethical nature of the research that we were under-

taking, especially when we read many of the comments on the study in Round 3 concerning the importance of respecting diverse epistemologies, addressing power imbalances and accountability to an 'ethical research process'.

Admittedly, the consensus-seeking nature of the Delphi approach might have further marginalised some political views held by CBR researchers from some disciplines and, as a result, in many 'political' VPs being eliminated. Most participants agreed that building equality or equity in relationships means addressing power explicitly; however, based on the 67 per cent cut-off, itemised VPs that included openly political terms such as power, anti-oppression, Indigenous and anti-colonial were dropped following the first round. In other words, at least among the respondents to this study, most did not agree with the 'political' nature of CBR. However, some respondents in the second round expressed concerns with this result. We realised that we did not have the means, given that the consensus of the group determined the final list of VPs, to deeply address the many tensions and systemic inequities that seemed to mark the texts of the survey responses. Fortunately, some members of the study spoke up during our workshop after Round 1 and consensus was reached to reinstate several VPs that otherwise would have been eliminated from the final list, due mainly, in our view, to the absence of certain marginalised voices, disciplines and non-mainstream approaches to research in the survey process. This was due in part to systemic inequities and institutional absences. Removing the most overtly politicised VPs was perceived by some respondents to leave academic

researchers in the privileged position that many scholars claim CBR is supposed to redress, and perhaps to undermine decolonial and anti-oppressive methodologies. In short, the tendency of the majority of respondents to opt for a relatively objective and apolitical position was viewed by others as masking what were fundamental issues of injustice which have significant impact on institutional practice of tenure, promotion and ethical approaches to CBR.

These findings raise many questions. What does it mean to suggest that CBR (or, indeed, any research) is non- or apolitical? What are the implications of resisting acknowledgement of the political nature of research? One of the critiques of objectivity in the literature is that it has been used to subordinate research subjects within specific projects as well as CBR researchers in the academy (Absolon & Willett 2005; Deloria 1997; Wells & Jones 2009). Is it possible or desirable to acknowledge one's positionality and simultaneously claim objectivity? Why do some researchers resist designating their research anti-oppressive or anti-colonial? What are the effects of this resistance for researchers, research participants, and CBR more broadly?

What is CBR for?

Building on the debate over the political nature of CBR, the question of whether positive social change was a meaningful research objective was also contested by participants. Although respondents agreed that CBR results should benefit all participants, there was less agreement on whether improving lives was a desirable or reasonable goal of CBR. It is interesting to note in this context that no itemised VP from the

category of 'Empowerment' passed the cut-off point.

Related to these questions, for some researchers critiquing the (presumably inequitable) status quo was crucial to their practice, while others argued that the status quo was not always in need of critique and that the goal of CBR should be discovery and knowledge creation. Yet, we wonder if CBR is simply aimed at the creation of new knowledge, how can researchers avoid reinscribing colonial relations or repeating the mistakes of past research that mined community members for their 'data' without improving their lives?

To be critical of power relationships implies the desire for change. We expected to see these concerns reflected in our findings. Although 'Action for positive social change' remained important for many participants, 'Transformation of fundamental structures' was removed after the first round. Once again, the more overtly political actions tended to be rejected. In other words, there was some agreement that action is an important principle of CBR, but much less agreement on the nature of the action, for example, whether the goal of action is to further decolonisation or something more mundane (e.g. publication of a report). This goes to the heart of the disagreement among participants: is CBR a political research approach aimed at action to improve lives, or is it an objective research approach that seeks to create new knowledge? Can it be both?

Implications for future research

Based on the findings and our related reflections, we propose the following addi-

tional questions about CBR may be worth exploring further:

What does 'political' mean in the context of CBR, and how political should CBR be?

As a research method, should CBR have a 'predetermined' outcome?

Does CBR require different forms of accountability compared to other methodologies?

Is 'action' an objective of CBR? What is the relationship between CBR, action and justice?

Is CBR only for marginalised/colonised groups? To what extent should CBR be informed by a particular discourse?

Is there any element that distinguishes CBR from other research approaches on which all CBR researchers could agree? Should CBR be defined?

To conclude, CBR is a growing research approach increasingly being adopted by researchers from diverse disciplines. While the findings reported here may fill a gap in the literature on which values and principles matter to CBR, they also raise additional questions for further exploration. The diverse perspectives on the political and action-oriented nature of CBR comprise an important issue that researchers and community members whose work comes under the CBR banner should address as more and more academic institutions begin to emphasise the importance of community-based research.

NOTE: Readers who would like to view the complete list of itemised VPs should contact the lead author.

References

Absolon, K & Willett, C 2005, 'Putting ourselves forward: Location in aboriginal research', in L Brown & S Strega (eds), *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*, Canadian Scholars Press, Toronto, ON, pp. 97–126.

Blumenthal, D 2011, 'Is community-based participatory research possible?', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, vol. 40, no. 3: pp. 386–89.
doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2010.11.011

Brydon-Miller, M, Greenwood, D & Maguire, P 2003, 'Why action research?', *Action Research*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14767503030011002>

Brydon-Miller, M & Maguire, P 2009, 'Participatory action research: Contributions to the development of practitioner inquiry in education', *Educational Action Research*, vol. 17, no. 1: pp. 79–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650790802667469>

Chen, P, Diaz, N, Lucas, G & Rosenthal, M 2010, 'Dissemination of results in community-based participatory research', *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, vol. 39, no. 4: pp. 372–78. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2010.05.021

Center for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) 2011, *Building equitable partnerships: Tools and lessons learned*, CAMH, Toronto, ON.

Cochran, P, Marshall, C, Garcia-Downing, C, Kendall, E, Cook, D, McCubbin, L & Gover, R 2008, 'Indigenous ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research and community', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 98, no. 1: pp. 22–27.
doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2006.093641

Cornwall, A 2008, 'Unpacking 'Participation': Models, meanings and practices', *Community Development Journal*, vol. 43, no. 3: pp. 269–83.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010>

Dalkey, N 1967, *Delphi*, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica.

Deloria Jr, V 1997, *Red earth white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*, Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO.

Elliott, P 2012, *Participatory action research: Challenges, complications, and opportunities*, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.

Fletcher, C 2003, 'Community-based participatory research relationships with aboriginal communities in Canada: An overview of context and process', *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal & Indigenous Community Health*, vol. 1, no. 1: pp. 27–62.

Flicker, S, Roche, B & Guta, A 2010, 'Peer research in action III: Ethical issues', *Community Based Research Working Paper Series*, The Wellesley Institute, Toronto, ON.

Flicker, S, Savan, B, Kolenda, B & Mildemberger, M 2008, 'A snapshot of community-based research in Canada: Who? What? Why? How?', *Health Education Research*, vol. 23, no. 1: pp. 106–14. doi: 10.1093/her/cym007

Freudenberg, N & Tsui, E 2014, 'Evidence, power, and policy change in community-based participatory research', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 104, no. 1: pp. 11–14.
doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2013.301471

- Geist, M 2010, 'Using the Delphi method to engage stakeholders: A comparison of two studies', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol. 33, no. 2: pp. 147–54. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.06.006
- Hall, B 2009, 'Higher education, community engagement, and the public good: Building the future of continuing education in Canada', *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, vol. 35, no.1, pp. 11–23.
- Haraway, D 1988, 'Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective', *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3: pp. 575–99. doi: 10.2307/3178066
- Hasson, F, Keeney, S & McKenna, H 2000, 'Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, vol. 32, no. 4: pp. 1008–15. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.t01-1-01567.x>
- Heffner, G, Zandee, G & Schwander, L 2003, 'Listening to community voices: Community-based research, a first step in partnership and outreach', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 8, no. 1: pp. 127–39.
- Hernández, E 2015, 'What is “good” research? Revealing the paradigmatic tensions in quantitative criticalist work', *New Directions for Institutional Research*, vol. 2014, no. 163: pp. 93–101. doi: 10.1002/ir.20088
- Horowitz, C, Robinson, M & Seifer, S 2009, 'Community-based participatory research from the margin to the mainstream', *Circulation*, vol. 11, no. 19: pp. 2633–42. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.107.729863
- Israel, B, Schulz, A, Parker, E & Becker, A 2001, 'Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research', *Education for Health*, vol. 14, no. 2: pp. 182–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280110051055>
- Jacklin, K & Kinoshameg, P 2008, 'Developing a participatory aboriginal health research project: “Only if it’s going to mean something”', *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, vol. 3, no. 2: pp. 53–67. doi: 10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.53
- Jacobson, M & Rugeley, C 2007, 'Community-based participatory research: Group work for social justice and community change', *Social Work with Groups*, vol. 30, no. 4: pp. 21–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J009v30n04_03
- Kirkness, V & Barnhardt, R 2001, 'First nations and higher education: The four R’s – respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility', in R Hayoe & J Pan, *Knowledge across cultures: A contribution to dialogue among civilizations*, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- McAreavey, R & Muir, J 2011, 'Research ethics committees: Values and power in higher education', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 14, no. 5: pp. 391–405. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2011.565635>
- Minkler, M 2004, 'Ethical challenges for the “outside” researcher in community-based participatory research', *Health Education & Behavior*, vol. 31, no. 6: pp. 684–97. doi: 10.1177/1090198104269566

- Ochocka, J & Janzen, R 2014, 'Breathing life into theory: Illustrations of community-based research – hallmarks, functions and phases', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 7, no. 1: pp. 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v7i1.3486>
- Okoli, C & Pawlowski, S 2004, 'The Delphi method as a research tool: An example, design considerations and applications', *Information & Management*, vol. 42, no. 1: pp. 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002>
- Ontario Women's Health Network (OWHN) 2009, *Inclusion research handbook*, OWHN, Toronto, ON.
- Reid, C, Tom, A & Frisby, W 2006, 'Finding the "action" in feminist participatory action research', *Action Research*, vol. 4, no. 3: pp. 315–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750306066804>
- Ross, L, Loup, A, Nelson, R, Botkin, J, Kost, R, Smith, G & Gehlert, S 2010, 'Human subjects protections in community-engaged research: A research ethics framework', *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, vol. 5, no. 1: pp. 5–17. doi: 10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.5
- Savan, B, Flicker, S, Kolenda, B & Mildemberger, M 2009, 'How to facilitate (or discourage) community-based research: Recommendations based on a Canadian survey', *Local Environment*, vol. 14, no. 8: pp. 783–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13549830903102177>
- Schwartz, K & van de Sande, A 2011, *Research for social justice: A community-based approach*, Fernwood, Halifax, NS.
- Shore, N, Drew, E, Brazauskas, R & Seifer, S 2011, 'Relationships between community-based processes for research ethics review and institution-based IRBs: A national study', *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, vol. 6, no. 2: pp. 13–21. doi: 10.1525/jer.2011.6.2.13
- Smith, L 2012, *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*, Zed Books, London.
- Speer, P & Christens, B 2013, 'An approach to scholarly impact through strategic engagement in community-based research', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 69, no. 4: pp. 734–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12039>
- Stanton, C 2014, 'Crossing methodological borders: Decolonizing community-based participatory research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 20, no. 5: pp. 573–83. doi: 10.1177/1077800413505541
- St Denis, V 1992, 'Community-based participatory research: Aspects of the concept relevant for practice', *Native Studies Review*, vol. 8, no. 2: pp. 51–74.
- Stoudt, B, Fox, M & Fine, M 2012, 'Contesting privilege with critical participatory action research', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 68, no. 1: pp. 178–93. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01743.x
- Tersine, R & Riggs, W 1976, 'The Delphi technique: A long-range planning tool', *Business Horizons*, vol. 19, no. 2: pp. 51–56. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813\(76\)90081-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(76)90081-1)

Wells, K & Jones, L 2009, "Research" in community-partnered, participatory research', *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 302, no. 3: pp. 320–21.
doi: 10.1001/jama.2009.1033

Wilson, S 2008, *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*, Fernwood, Halifax, NS.

Yan, M & Tsang, K 2005, 'A snapshot on the development of social work education in China: A Delphi study', *Social Work Education*, vol. 24, no. 8: pp. 883–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615470500342314>

State administrative and contractual character of labor law relations of civil servants

Oruj Jamil Mammadov

Academy of Public Administration under the President of Azerbaijan, assistant professor of Law, PhD on law

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/jpapyr88.v11i1.5439>

Abstract

The place of labor law relations of civil servants in the system of relations between state administration and labor contract, its theoretical-conceptual and legal basis were analyzed in the article. There were touched upon the elements which combine labor of civil servants in the system of relations of state administration and labor contract character. Labor relations of civil servants have complex composition elements. Implementation of these relations in state bodies is one of the main factors which stipulates the complexity of its composition. Another factor includes the possibility of implementation of mainly two constitutional rights of the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan – right to work and right to take part in governing the state. Along with the organization and activity of state power and state administrative bodies in accordance with the legislation, state administrative relations, in accordance with their status and competence, arises in connection with the implementation of the objectives and functions of the state. Public relations forming the subject of legal regulation of civil service relations are the legal model of public relations fixed in the legislation on civil service. Labor relations of civil servants act as the part of system of civil service legal relations. Here mainly, legal relations on two aspects attract more attention. One of these relations is the legal relations arising on state administration based on the principle of power-subordination. And the other are the legal relations arising on the implementation of the constitutional right to work in state bodies based on the principle of freedom of labor and on the labor contract. The main subject of the both legal relations is civil servants. This aspect combines labor law relations of civil servants in the system of relations of state administration and labor contract character.

Keywords: civil service, civil servants, state administrative relations, labor and law relations, labor contract

Introduction

The process of state-building in the Republic of Azerbaijan is conditioned with complex reforms and durable nature. The efficient and purposeful reforms founded by the national leader HeydarAliyev being regularly continued and developed are successfully implemented by the President of Azerbaijan Republic IlhamAliyev. One of the missions these reforms put forward is provision of an expediency and efficiency in state administration. Professional civil service activity holds a great place among the factors conditioning expediency and efficiency in state administration. The civil service is one of the main provision means of implementation of state government and state administration.

Highly evaluating significance of the civil service the President of Azerbaijan Republic IlhamAliyev noted that "To work in a civil service of the independent Azerbaijan Republic is very honorable for any person. It means that this citizen is trusted to be in the first rows of building of an independent and democratic state and civil society. Every person should know that to be in a civil service is not a privilege, it is a responsibility. It is an opportunity to serve to the people. Not depending on the level and significance of the held position, the civil servant should remember that he is the servant of the nation and his main duty is to serve to the people and to take care of them. (8.p.77-78).

These ideas put forward by the president of Azerbaijan Republic IlhamAliyev bear a great significance from scientific and theoretical, as well from practical point of view, they combine in themselves social,

political, legal, moral, ethical, psychological and other important peculiarities and impose a number of duties before Azerbaijan science, including law.

The norms regulating legal relations of the civil service and defining the status of the civil servants make the main part of different legal areas, mainly Constitution, administrative, labor and social provision legislature systems. Besides it, uniting these norms lay ground for establishment of independent legal area- the state civil service law, systematization of legislation on civil service, consolidation of it in a single legislative act, consolidation of it in a codex, i.e. acceptance of the civil Service Codex of Azerbaijan Republic.

From this point of view it can be said that at present time the state civil service legislation is in the final stage of formation as an independent law area. Analysis of each worker category with different status separately, as well as legal regulation of labor relations of civil servants from scientific point of view is one of the important missions in the modern constitution and labor law sciences. The civil servants get a special worker status by implementing constitutional labor law in the state organs. They enter to the row of subjects of labor law as the worker category with a special status. Determination of the position of labor legal relations of civil servers in the system of state administration and labor contract relations, analysis of its theoretical, conceptual and legal bases, defining the solution ways of practical problems are of great importance. According to the above mentioned, it can be said that the issue about uniting the labor relations of the civil

servants in state administration and labor contract relations system is characterized by urgency both from scientific and theoretical and practical aspect.

Explanation of the keymaterial. Evaluating activity of the civil servants the President of Azerbaijan Republic IlhamAliyev noted that at the modern time when dynamic development processes are taking place in all spheres of our country and when perspective social and economic development programs are being implemented the civil servants have new and modern requirements before them. Being a sample of high professionalism, competence, morality and spirituality, they should gain respect for the official organs by their activity, behavior, decisions and actions they perform and should inspire the citizens for purposes and missions of the state policy. The civil servants should be guided by law supremacy, loyalty to their positional obligations, humanism, social justice principles, and coordinate the interests of the citizen with the interest of the state [8, p.77].

According to Academician R.A. Mehdiyev, in a modern time efficient state administration is built on the unity of legal, political and so-called "state management" principles and activity of the civil servants is evaluated according to the main criteria of the management [12, p.8]. According to Prof. A.Z. Abdullayev, there are different approaches in the social science to the "civil service" concept. The following two approaches are more preferable: - as a particular type of labor activity; as a legal institution of the state [7, p.259]. As one of the results of the extensive scientific analyzes, Prof. A.H. Rzayev states that a high-level civil service plays an important

role in an efficient activity of a civil and democratic state, in one of the important institutions of state administration apparatus – in the activity of the state apparatus and gives a dynamics to them [13, p.20]. G.V. Atamanchuk considers that the civil service is a practical and professional activity of the citizens for implementation of missions and functions of the state via performance of the state positions founded in the state organs [14, p.137]. According to D.N. Bakhrakh, the civil service is first of all a state service, i.e. is a certain activity for implementation of functions and missions in the state organizations upon the state's tasks and for a salary [15, p.5].

We think that one of the main priority directions of the modern state administration consists of improvement of the existing legal bases, creation of new administrative mechanisms, systematization of the state government and state administrative bodies, formation of a corps of professional civil servants, efficient usage of the potential of the civil servants, increasing the level of service and professionalism, and provision of efficient usage of management practice and labor.

Social relations emerging in the sphere of state administration are regulated by the legal acts adopted by the state government and state administration. The state administrative relations can be expressed in narrow and wide meanings as follows.

In a narrow meaning the state administrative relations can be explained as a complex of social relations in which the interests of the state are expressed. In a wide meaning, they can be explained as a complex of social relations emerging in the sphere of implementation of missions and

functions of the state in accordance with the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic and other legislative acts.

Organization and activity of state administrative relations are implemented in accordance with the existing legislation of the state government and state administrative bodies and they are changed or terminated in accordance with the missions and functions of the state.

According to the above-mentioned, it can be said that labor relations of the civil servants contain complex integral parts. Implementation of these relations in state government and state administrative bodies is one of the main factors conditioning its complex character.

Another factor is that it contains mainly two constitutional rights of the citizens of Azerbaijan Republic- labor right and the right of participation in the state administration. So, in the 35th article of the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic the "Labor right" and in the 55th article "The right of participation in the state administration" confirms the above-mentioned. Constitutional norms combine labor relations of civil servants with the state administrative and labor contractual relations.

According to R.A.Mehdiyev, the civil service is a field of activity having a great significance in consolidation of state-building of independent Azerbaijan Republic, in implementation of social and economic programs, in cultural development and generally, in regulation of different spheres of the society.

The main missions of civil service include provision of rights and freedoms of the citizens given to them in accordance with the Constitution and other legislative

acts, preparation of decisions within framework of authority of the state organs, their adoption, execution and supervision on its execution, as well as provision of implementation of efficient activity of state organs and positional duties by the civil servants [11, p.575]. The authors of the state and law theories rightly note that "classification of legal relations is carried out by legal regulation methods- administrative relations based on mutual governmental relations of subjects and contractual relations inherent to equality of the parties" [17, p.541]. To my opinion, alongside the other spheres, this classification directly includes in itself characteristics of labor legal relations of civil servants. Both of the above-mentioned peculiarities attract attention while implementation of legal relations of civil service. According to the theoretical provisions and legislation on civil service, it can be said that the legal relations emerging upon activity of the civil servants contain both administrative relations based on mutual governmental relations, and the relations arising from labor contract including in it legal equality of the parties.

Complexity of the legal relations emerging upon the activity of the civil servants is the indicator of their state-legal status. The bases of this activity is the constitutional labor right. The complex of norms regulating social relations included to the subject of the labor right contains specific provisions in it. According to Prof. A.M.Gasimov, social relations assume a form of legal relations if there are two conditions. Firstly, these social relations are needed to be reflected in people's willful behavior acts. Secondly, it should neces-

sarily be regulated by appropriate legal norms [9, 107]. Based on the contract between the parties with equal rights, and unlike the individual right protecting individual interest of an individual or a collective subject,

“Social legal norms are directed to general welfare and protection of state interests and are a part of a valid legal system related with the authorities of the state and organizational – governing activity and implementation of social mission and duties”

[23, p.5]. As one of the characteristics typical for the social right it can be noted that one of the participants of the social legal relations have authorities in relation with the others. No common idea has been formed about the issue about the social and individual and legal character of the legal relations of the civil servants. The essence of the assumptions put forward by the specialists on labor right is that the relations about enrollment of the civil servants to the state civil service, their activity there and termination of their activity are labor legal relations [20, p.10]. Supporting these ideas, it should be noted that this approach has been confirmed in Labor Codex of Azerbaijan Republic (hereafter, LC AR) (2), in the Law of Azerbaijan Republic on Civil Service (5) taking into consideration different categories of the workers, as well as the peculiarities of the legal regulation of the labor of civil servants and in other appropriate normative legal acts regulating civil service relations, also in the Convention №151 dated on June, 27, 1978 of International Labor Organization on “Protection of organizational right of employment in civil service and the method of determination of

employment conditions” ratified by Azerbaijan Republic, as well as

in the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic (1) regulating labor rights of everyone. Specific peculiarities of legal regulation of labor relations of civil servants do not change the nature of these relations, only includes in it different approach to the subject of salary of civil servants. Some representatives of labor right agree that the service in military forces, in the organs of internal affairs, in frontier troops, in intelligence and counter-intelligence agencies do not refer to the subject of the labor right and that they make the subject of administrative right [24, p.9]. In this case we mean only law and enforcement and military service. But in some cases, changes are applied paying attention to the tendency of combination of appropriate relations emerging upon labor – (e.g. military service referring to labor right field, and it, in its turn, will have a new direction) [18, p.29].

To our opinion, the bases of the activity of this category of people are implementation of a constitutional labor right. We think that one of the main elements characterizing social and legal aspects of social relations regulating civil service is a legal model of social relations determined in the legislation about civil service. Besides the legal model of the legal relations of the civil service, theoretical analyzes also is of great importance. One of the main characteristic aspects of the social and individual nature of legal relations of the civil service is coincidence of the elements referring to the structure of it with the labor legal relations. The elements referring to the structure of the legal relations of labor and civil service, naturally, do not coincide

completely. This characteristic arises from social – legal nature of the legal relations of civil service.

The representatives of labor legal theory paid a special attention to the labor legal relations in their works and presented them in an extensive way. Referring to the hired nature of the civil service, the representatives of labor legal science claim that labor relations of the civil servants can be referred to the subject of labor law [24, s.9]. Prof. A.M.Gasimov (and others) considers that nature of the labor relations of civil servants characterize these relations as service relations (serving) [10, p.137]. According to the authors, “unity of labor law is proved by the collection of indestructible internal relations of norms regulating social relations in labor law field. Unity is characterized with determination of general aim and duties of legal regulation, specificity of the mutual legal impact to the social relations containing the subject of the regulation, equality of the main labor rights and duties, commonness of their realization. Specificity of legal impact means to the social relations making the subject of the legal regulation shows itself in coordination of centralized and local, contractual and governmental regulation, as well as participation of the employees in determination of labor legal norms” [10, s.12]. Y.B.Khokhlov notes that “the mechanism of legal regulation of the social labor being almost formed from the legal aspect in the statics appears as a certain system of legal norms and legal institutions and in the dynamics as the set of legal relations. Therefore, it can be determined as the mechanism of legal regulation of labor relations and from one hand, as an economic

mechanism this concept covers both categories (objective and subjective categories) of the law, and on another hand its implementation [21, s.141]. Agreeing with this assumption put forward by Y.B.Khokhlov it can be concluded that the mechanism of legal regulation of labor relations appears as a set of legal relations in its dynamics.

Taking into consideration of specific characteristics of legal regulation of the labor of civil servants N.G.Alexandrov considers that “the relations related with civil service of judges or the officials with authorities are regulated by the social law” [22, s.30]. According to E.N.Banderenko, “it should not be forgotten that in fact regulation of service relations via individual and collective contract is excluded, and this case leads to emergence of serious differences in legal situation of subjects traditional for labor law. Besides it, majority of conditions of labor contract with a civil servant even the party of the labor contract is determined not with a public administrative body, but directly with the state” [16, s.61]. E.B.Khokhlov holding a right position states that “the role of the labor contract on the basis of labor (service) relations is only legal factor. It is an agreement about entering to the civil service with the conditions not pre-determined in the contract [25, s.279]. The civil servant is not only a hired employee, he is also a person speaking on behalf of the state, protecting the interests of the state, and society (26. p.79)

In the administrative law theory civil service relations are mainly divided into two groups: the relations emerging in the process of organization of the civil service and the relations emerging during carrying out the civil service in practice. The

relations referring to the first group and entering to the system of out-of-apparatus legal relations condition the legal relations of the civil service and bears administrative and legal nature. According to A.M.Abdullayev and F.T.Naghiyev, administrative legal norms regulating state building issues makes an independent institution of administrative law [3, s.69]. V.A.Yusupov considers that the legal institutions providing and detecting principles of the civil service, its implementation rules, positional authorities and obligations of civil servants, attestation of employees are characterized with two peculiarities: similarity and homogeneity of administrative relations regulated by them and specific manifestation of administrative and legal method of influence of social relations to this group [28, p.44]. The second-group relations act as an integral part of in-apparatus legal relations and as a rule, are included to the field of labor legal relations. L.I.Chikanova rightly considers that service and labor legal relations are within the state-service (administrative- legal) relations and they are included to the content of the latter [27, p.17]. To our opinion, development of the legislation about the civil service as a result led to emergence of specialization in the field of regulation of in-apparatus relations regulated by the labor legal norms. However, although the civil service according to its formal content identifies in itself analogical legal norms, it is not possible completely to release the civil service legal institution from the influence of legal norms. According to the above-mentioned, it can be said that individual legal methods are used during regulation of legal relations within framework

of in-apparatus relations. According to the legal nature of civil service legal relations are administrative-legal relations. Besides it, scientific-theoretical and normative provisions show that separate methods containing individual –legal regulation method are used. At the same time, it should be taken into consideration that civil servants during implementation of civil service do not have the legal status equal to the heads of the state administrative bodies that have employed them. The civil service legal relations emerging in the process of organization of the civil service have administrative-legal, in other words, social –legal nature, however in-apparatus civil service legal relations have individual –legal nature. Civil service legal relations are characterized as the set of administrative legal relations containing in it complex internal components.

The main part of the normative provisions of the Law of Azerbaijan Republic about Civil Service regulates legal status of civil servants, as well as their labor legal relations. In the 34th article of the Law of Azerbaijan Republic on Civil Service it is said that “ The other issues related with the enrollment to the civil service not regulated in this Law and in other related legislative acts are regulated with labor legislation of Azerbaijan Republic (5). In the 34th article of the Law a norm is given for subsidiary legal regulation of labor right norms of civil service legal relations.

In the second part of the 5th article of LC AR called “Other work places and employees to which this Codex is applied” it is stated that “This Codex refers to civil servants, as well as employees of prosecution, police and other law enforcement bodies

taking into consideration peculiarities determined with normative legal acts regulating their legal status. If labor, social and economic rights of these servants have not been covered in these normative legal acts, then the appropriate norms given in this Codex are applied to them”(2).

According to the 35th article of the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic called “Labor Right” it is stated that “Labor is the bases of individual and social welfare. Everyone has a right to choose an activity field, profession, specialization and work place in accordance with his labor abilities. No one can be made work against his will. Labor contracts are freely concluded. No one can be made to conclude a labor contract against his will.” [1].

According to Prof.A.M.Gasimov, citizens in the labor market implement the labor right mainly in the following ways: conclusion of a labor contract; becoming a member of a joint stock company; to enter the civil service; private entrepreneurship. Implementation of the labor right is conditioned in the first case with the citizen, in the second case with the assumption of the employer, in the third case with additional legal facts as appointment or election to a position [9, p.221].

In the first part of the 42nd article of the Labor Codex of Azerbaijan Republic called “Parties of a Labor Contract” it is stated that “Labor contracts are concluded freely.If a man does not make or does not want to make labor relations, he cannot be made to conclude a labor contract” (2). According to the 28.6 article of the Law of Azerbaijan Republic on Civil Service, if no other rule is designed in the legislation, and if the recommendation is positive, the pro-

bationer is accepted to the civil service by concluding a contract for six months test period. ... If the labor contract is not terminated during the test period, then once that time is over, in accordance with the conditions of the contract, the head of the state organ gives an order about accepting that person to the civil service and concludes an appropriate labor contract with him (5).

In labor law science simple and complex bases of establishment of labor legal relations are distinguished. Prof. A.M.Gasimov’s assumptions related with this issue are of great importance. According to the author, “as a rule, labor contract acts as the bases in establishment of labor legal rights. There is a direct instruction about it in the 7th article of LC AR. But in some cases, only labor contract is not enough for establishment of labor legal relations, i.e. labor legislation concludes it with several legal acts. As the set, these legal acts acting as the bases of the labor legal relations own a complex legal content. Existence of these complex contents, first of all, is distinguished with specificity of labor of separate categories of workers, and complexity and responsibility of the work they carry out” [9, p.121]. One of this type of such categories of workers is civil servants. The civil servants in their turn have internal classification.

In the 7th article (“Regulation of labor relations with legislation and contract”) of the LC AR it is stated that “Excepting 2-1 part of the 7th article of this Codex, labor relations are established once the notification of the labor contract is registered in the electron information system by means of an electron signature and this

information is sent to the employer in an electronic way”

In the 2-1 part of the above – mentioned article it is stated that “The labor relations with the employed workers adopted to relevant positions (professions) of the state organs the list of which is confirmed by an appropriate executive government are established once the labor contract between them is concluded on the paper.” As it seems, the labor contract acts as a legal fact creating a right. Conclusion of the labor contract conditions establishment of labor legal relations. Besides it, it should be noted that labor legal relations can exist in different forms.

In the Decree (6) of the President of Azerbaijan Republic dated on July, 08, 2014, “The List of the positions (professions) created when labor relations in the state organs are concluded in a written form on the paper” is confirmed. According to this Decree, that list includes the positions election or appointment of which is carried out by MilliMajlis of Azerbaijan Republic; the positions appointment of which is carried out by the President of Azerbaijan Republic or Cabinet of Ministers of Azerbaijan Republic with the instruction of the President of Azerbaijan Republic; the positions election or appointment of which are carried out by the Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic or the chairman of the Supreme Assembly of Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic; special ranks inprosecution, justice, emergency situations, migration service, internal affairs, customs, tax, foreign affairs and special service bodies; positions held by the civilian employees engaged in intelligence and counter-intelligence activity.

To our opinion, the provisions stated in the legislation once again confirm that labor relations of civil servants refer to administrative-legal and individual-legal relations system. Legal relations are not mandatorily bear administrative-legal and individual-legal character. Legislative system about civil service includes the norms about different legal fields making a single unity. Nature and diversity of legal relations of civil service are also confirmed by S.V.Dorokhov’s scientific assumptions about lack of an exact border between social and individual right. According to the author, it conditions possibility of transition of formal elements of social and individual right to different legal field [9, s.45].

As one of the part of the legal relations of civil service – employer is the state; another part is a civil servant. Consequently, as the subject of legal relations of civil service, the state, the heads of state government and state administrative bodies act as employers. Here bilateral legal subjectivity attracts attention: legal relations established between the civil servant and the state; legal relations established between the head of the state organ representing the state, and the civil servant. Civil servants are not ordinary workers adopted to the state service individually. As the subject of the constitutional and administrative right, the civil servants have special status and authorities. The civil servants act as the representatives of the administrative government. Therefore, they have a right to make decisions of state governmental and state administrative character. From the point of view of salary, it can be said that the civil servants are the category of workers with a special status.

One of the main characteristics of the legal relations object of civil service is that these relations are not for gaining personal aims, but for implementation of missions and functions of the state in accordance with the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic and other legislative acts. The content of legal relations of the civil service consists of special rights, duties, terminations, prohibitions and provisions based on the principles of the civil service.

According to the legislation on the civil service, the civil servants undergo civil service depending on the legal status. Taking into consideration the state service being a complex legal institution and making a unity together with a legislation system, existence of service-labor concept in a scientific turnover, civil service being one of the types of professional activity, civil servants being the category of workers of a special rank and other aspects, it can be said that the norms of labor law influences on the activity of all civil servants caring out mission and functions of the state, state government and administrative bodies of all categories.

Labor legal norms hold a special place in legal regulation of administrative relations established in civil service field, as well as in legal regulation of labor relation of civil servants. From this point of view it can be said that separate norms of labor legislation are performed as the provisions of the normative legal act without undergoing serious changes, just being modified in a necessary level taking into consideration specific peculiarities of each civil service activity.

Result. As the conclusion of the conducted scientific analyzes the followings can

be stated. The main priority directions of modern state administration consist of improvement of existing legal basis, establishment of a new administration mechanism, systemization of a state government and state administration bodies, formation of a corps of professional civil servants, usage of potential of civil servants, increase of their service and professionalism level, provision of efficient usage of administration experience and labor.

Social relations established in the state administration field are regulated by the legal acts adopted by the state government and state administration bodies. The state administrative relations can be expressed in narrow and wide meanings as follows.

In the narrow meaning, the state administrative relations can be called the complex of administrative relations in which the interest of the state is expressed, in the wide meaning they can be called the set of administrative relations established in the field of implementation of the missions and functions of the state in accordance with the Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic and other legislative acts.

The state administrative relations are established, changed and terminated in relation with organization and activity of the state government and state administrative bodies in accordance with the current legislation, as well as implementation of missions and functions of the state in accordance with their status and authorities. Administrative relations making the subject of legal regulation of civil service relations are

legal model of the administrative relations identified in the legislation on civil service.

According to theoretical provisions and legislation on civil service, it can be said that the legal relations established upon activity of civil servants include both administrative relations based on mutual governmental relations, and the relations upon labor contract containing in it legal equality of the parties.

One of the typical characteristics of civil service legal relations is coincidence of the elements included in its structure with the labor legal relations. Labor relations of civil servants act as the integral part of the legal relations of the civil service. Here, legal relations attract attention mainly from two aspects. One of these relations is the legal relations established on civil administration based government – subordina-

tion principle. The other is legal relations established in accordance with the labor contract and implementation of constitutional labor relations in state organs based on freedom of labor principle. The main subject of both two legal relations is a civil servant. This aspect combines labor legal relations of civil servants in the system of relations of civil administration and labor contract character.

Labor relations of civil servants acts both as an integral part of the social-legal relations emerging in the process of organization of civil service, and also of individual-legal relations established during implementation of in-apparatus relations. Through mutual unity these administrative relations having social-legal and individual-legal character make a system of legal relations of a unified civil service.

References

1. Constitution of Azerbaijan Republic. Baku: Legal literature, 2009, 96 p.
2. Labor Codex of Azerbaijan Republic. Baku: Legal literature, 2016, 304 p.
3. Abdullayev A.M., Naghiyev F.T. Administrative law. Manual. Baku: Ganun, 2008, 800 p.
4. Decree of MilliMajlis/ Information of Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan Republic on Azerbaijan's joining to Convention "On protection of right of organization of employment in civil service and the ways of determination of employment conditions" of International Labor Organization, 1993, №02, article 46
5. Law of Azerbaijan Republic № 926-IQ on Civil service dated on July, 21, 2000 / Legislative Acts of Azerbaijan Republic, 2001, №01, article 1
6. Decree № 206 of the President of Azerbaijan Republic dated on July, 08, 2014, on "The List of the positions (professions) created when labor relations in the state organs are concluded in a written form on the paper", /Legislation of Azerbaijan Republic, 2014, №07, article 788
7. Theory of civil administration. Manual. With editorship of S.T.Gandilov. Baku: Science and education, 2010, 552 p.
8. Aliyev I.H. Development is our goal. The eighteenth book. June, 2006 – August, 2006. Baku: Azerneshr, 2014, 424 p.

9. Gasimov A.M. Labor law. Manual. Baku: Adiloghlu, 2007, 560 p.
10. Gasimov A.M., Jafarov Z.I., Huseynov A.I. Unity and differentiation of legal regulation of labor relations: Manual. Baku: Ganun, 2015, 196 p.
11. Mehdiyev R.A. On the way of national ideology, state-building, and independence. Volume II (articles, speeches, interviews). Baku: XXI –House of new publications, 2006, 672 p.
12. Mehdiyev R.A. Double standards in the world order and modern Azerbaijan. Baku, East-West Publishing House, 2015, 224 p.
13. Rzayev A.H. Constitutional and legal problems of the civil service of Azerbaijan Republic: PhD on Law, Synopsis of thesis. Baku, 2012, 55 p.
14. Atamanchuk G.V. Essence of a civil service: history, theory, law, practices: Monography. M.: RAGS, 2008, 312 p.
15. Bakhrakh D.N. General issues on service in soviet state and public organizations // Service in the state and public organizations. Sverdlovsk, 1988, p.4-15
16. Bondarenko E.N. *Labor contract as the bases of establishment of legal relations*. SPb: Legal center Press, 2004, 226 p.
17. Golovistikova A.N., Dmitryev Y.A. Theory of state and law. Manual. M.: Eskmo, 2005, 592 p.
18. Gusov K.N., Tolkunova V.N. Labor law of Russia: Manual. M.: TKVelbi, Prospect, 2004, 496 p.
19. Dorokhin S.V. Division of law into social and individual: Constitutional- legal aspect. M., VoltersKluver, 2008, 136 p.
20. Ivanov S.A., Ivankina T.V., Kurennoy T.V., Mavrin S.P., Khokhlov E.B., Legal regulations of relations in the sphere of civil service // EJ-Lawyer, 2004, №6, p.8-13
21. Course on Russian labor law: in 3 volumes, T. 3. Labor contract /under editorship of E.B.Khokhlova. SPb.: R.Aslanova «Legal center Press», 2007, 656 p.
22. Soviet labor law/ Under editorship of N.G.Alexandrovna. M.: Legal.lit., 1972, 576 p.
23. *Theory of the state and law. Manual* /Under editorship of A.S.Pigolkina, Y.A.Dmitriyeva. M.: Yurayt, 2011, 743 p.
24. Labor law. Manual / under editorship of O.V.Smirnova. M.: “TKVelbi” ltd., 2003, 528 p.
25. *Labor legislation of Russia*: Manual /Under editorship of S.P.Marvin, E.B.Khokhlov, M.Norm: INFRA-M, 2013, 608 p.
26. Cherpanov V.V., Ivanov V.P. Fundamentals of civil service and personnel policy: Manual. M.: YUNITI-DANA, Law and right, 2008, 575 p.
27. Chikanova L.A. Application of labor legislation to labor relations related with the civil service: theory and practices: Synopsis of thesis PhD on Law. M., 2005, 45 p.
28. Yusupov V.A. Theory of administrative law. M.: Yurid. lit., 1985, 160 p.

Insights on Definitions, Practice and Evaluation Policies

Nicoleta Bateman

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Department of Liberal Studies, California

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7/jpapyr.v11i1.5439>

Abstract

This article contributes to the current conversation surrounding the definition of community-engaged scholarship (CES) by providing critical insights from a linguist's journey towards establishing a CES partnership with a middle school. I argue that a prescribed CES definition for all disciplines is neither possible nor desirable. CES has gained appeal in recent years because of the mutual benefits promised by the scholar–community partner collaboration. At the same time, the conversation around defining CES is ongoing, highlighting the difficulties in establishing a single definition of CES for all disciplines. In response, individual institutions have adopted their own definition in an effort to help their faculty members navigate CES and assist their efforts towards satisfying requirements for promotion and tenure. While designed to ensure rigorous scholarship and true community involvement, institutional-specific definitions can unintentionally limit a scholar's CES options, particularly given the expectations of the tenure and promotion process. As a result, scholars in disciplines which are not well understood outside academia, such as linguistics, find themselves ill-positioned to engage in CES. And as the general public is unfamiliar with the discipline and its benefits, developing mutually beneficial partnerships with community organisations requires an extensive amount of time – more than is usually required of other disciplines engaged in CES. Furthermore, tenure and promotion timeline expectations may be incompatible with CES work for some disciplines. Two solutions are proposed to address these challenges. First, scholars in disciplines such as linguistics must utilise multiple approaches to developing partnerships, such as volunteerism, community outreach and cross-disciplinary collaboration, and be intentional in college classrooms in engaging undergraduates in activities that make the discipline relevant outside academia. Second, they must challenge current CES definitions and interpretations and advocate for policy changes to the tenure and promotion process on their individual campuses.

Keywords: *linguistics, CES definitions, interpretation and recognition, partnership pre-requisites*

Introduction

This article is a critical reflection of a linguist's journey towards community-engaged scholarship (CES). It presents insights gained from this process on how researchers in disciplines less known outside academia can begin to conduct CES, and on the current conversation surrounding the various definitions of CES and their interpretation for the tenure and promotion process. Over the past two decades, a welcome shift has been experienced by academia as universities and national organisations supporting them place ever-growing importance on meaningful research and knowledge arising from faculty-community partnerships because of the mutual benefit promised by such collaborations (Boyer 1996). This does not mean that such meaningful work did not exist before, rather that it has taken centre stage (Fitzgerald et al. 2016; Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013; Morrison & Wagner 2016). Current approaches to engaged scholarship reside on the understanding that academia is not the exclusive generator of knowledge, and that non-academic settings are a source of tremendous learning opportunities and scholarship (Boyer 1996; Fitzgerald et al. 2016). Furthermore, the current view of engagement 'posits a new framework of scholarship that moves away from emphasizing products to emphasizing impact' (Fitzgerald et al. 2016). However, practice has lagged behind promise (Ward & Miller 2016). Given the requirements and expectations of academics, such as the role of scholarship (publications) in tenure and promotion, and the

creation of opportunities for students to engage in work with the community, exactly what counts as scholarship in the community has been the subject of much debate (Barker 2004; Fitzgerald et al. 2016; Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013; Janke & Colbeck 2008; O'Meara & Niehaus 2009; Sandmann 2008; Wade & Demb 2009, 2012).

Because of the complexity surrounding the factors that influence faculty engagement (e.g. beliefs about student learning, pedagogy, connections to community, shared epistemology), it has been difficult to find a common definition of engaged scholarship (Morrison & Wagner 2016). In this article I argue that a prescribed common definition is, in fact, not possible or desirable. In general, community-engaged scholarship is 'scholarship that involves a mutually beneficial partnership with community members or organisations outside of the academy' (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005). However, because work with community partners includes service-learning, community-based participatory research and other types of community-based work, and because the conversation about how CES is defined is ongoing, some scholars wonder whether their research in the community qualifies as CES for purposes of tenure and promotion (Calleson, Jordan & Seifer 2005; Furco 2010; Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013). In an effort to support their faculty members, individual universities develop their own definitions – in itself an

acknowledgement of the ongoing conversation.

Based on my experience as a linguist starting on a path towards CES, I argue that existing definitions and their campus-level adaptations can unintentionally limit understanding of what CES is for some disciplines, including linguistics. For scholars in these disciplines that are little known outside academia, the path towards CES is much longer than for those in fields that are better understood by the general public, such as STEM disciplines and public health, the birthplace of CES, and steps taken along the way should be recognised by institutions (<https://www.ccphealth.org/>); Maurana et al. 2001). While developing trusting, meaningful relationships with community partners – a prerequisite for CES – is time-consuming and labour-intensive for anyone, regardless of discipline, I argue that some scholarly fields face an additional challenge because the community (here, anyone outside academia) is unfamiliar with their existence and the objectives of the discipline in the first place.

As a linguist who primarily teaches prospective K–8 teachers, my interest in CES is fuelled by a desire to promote the personal and societal benefits of the scientific study of language to the broader community. Here, I use ‘broader community’ to refer in general to people outside academia who may otherwise never consider the benefits of linguistics as they navigate the multiple communities to which they belong. The idea of community has typically been tied to place (Dunham 1986); however, as language users and active social beings, we all be-

long to various communities, some defined by place, some by language, and some by other means such as common interests and undertakings (Bloomfield 1933; Gumperz 1971; Labov 1972). For the purpose of this article, the community is viewed more specifically as a classroom with students and teachers, and it is also further extended to the school, the students’ and teachers’ families, and to those with whom they interact (Battistich et al. 1995; Brown 1997). While the benefits of understanding language from a scientific perspective are obvious to linguists, they are not immediately obvious to the community. Of utmost importance is the issue of social justice centring around language use and recognition that all dialects of a language are linguistically equal. While most forms of expressing prejudice are frowned upon, overt discrimination based on language is still accepted today because the general public does not understand how language works. Thus, non-stan-

dard dialects of English as well as various immigrant languages are viewed as ‘bad’ and therefore speakers of those language varieties are viewed as less valuable members of society (Baugh 2005; Crawford 1995). A clear case for understanding linguistic diversity as an issue of social justice is presented by bilingual education, which has historically been viewed as an issue for ethnic minority students. Policies have generally favoured the linguistic and cultural majority, with most bilingual programs resulting in monolingualism rather than bilingualism. By making knowledge about language and linguistics accessible to those outside ac-

ademia, transforming current practices into 'communally-based practices of global learning' can lead to achievable goals of bilingualism, biculturalism, and biliteracy both for ethnic minority and ethnic majority students (Akkari & Loomis 1998, 2012). With a better understanding of language via linguistic study prior to college, students and teachers would begin a ripple effect that would eventually spread throughout their communities, leading to less language-based discrimination. Furthermore, this would have a greater societal impact than studying linguistics only in college, as not every student attends college, and not every college student studies linguistics. To get to this point, however, students and teachers need to understand the building blocks of language and language development in order to arrive at the conclusion that all language varieties are linguistically equal; this can be achieved via working partnerships between linguists and K-12 schools. Nevertheless, because of the disconnect between what linguistics is and does, and the community's unfamiliarity with or lack of understanding of linguistics, establishing such partnerships in a way that is mutually beneficial and not driven by the academy is extremely time-consuming. Teachers need time to understand the potential contributions of linguistics to themselves and their students, and their potential contributions to the academy; the linguist has to do the same.

While I am now engaged in such a partnership with a teacher at a local middle school, it took more than two years to develop a relationship based on mutual

trust which, in turn, brought us to the point where we could begin a truly bidirectional partnership that also involved scholarship – in the sense of outcomes that are 'rigorous and peer-reviewed' (Gelmon et al. 2012). In this article I reflect critically on insights gained from this process and offer linguists and scholars from other lesser known disciplines suggestions for becoming involved in CES, as well as encourage them to challenge the definitions of CES and their interpretation for the tenure and promotion process.

CES definitions and their interpretations

Over the past two decades CES has been identified as one of the core missions of higher education (Boyer 1996; Gelmon et al. 2013, p. 58). One goal of CES is for disciplinary faculty to use their expertise in collaboration with community partners, thereby simultaneously creating new knowledge and contributing to the public good. This has been highly appealing to universities and researchers who want to take their work outside academia and create meaningful and mutually beneficial partnerships, responding to Boyer's (1996, p. 11) challenge for higher education to 'become a more vigorous partner in the search for answers to our most pressing social, civic, economic and moral problems and ... reaffirm its historic commitment to ... the scholarship of engagement' (*italics added*). While this sounds positive from all perspectives, it also presents some unexpected challenges. On the one hand, exactly how to define the 'scholarship of engagement' and community-engaged scholarship is still currently the subject of debate, which

leaves room for differences in interpretation. On the other hand, current definitions assume that all disciplines should be able to engage in CES in the same way. Over the years, the term engaged scholarship (or scholarship of engagement) has referenced a multitude of university-community collaborative work, including service-learning, community-based participatory research, outreach, community development, and different forms of civic engagement (Calleson, Jordan & Seifer 2005; Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013; Sandmann 2008). These different types of engagement obviously have different outcomes and levels of scholarship, which impact aspects of tenure and promotion expectations. Sandmann (2008, p. 101), in her review of the literature on what the scholarship of engagement has meant over the years, concludes that CES is 'still emerging from its "definitional anarchy" and is still evolving as an interdisciplinary field for academic research'. Community-engaged scholarship currently combines 'the principles of community engagement with accepted standards of scholarship' (Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013, p. 59), and is thus defined further at the level of the institution. This is an important point, because scholars work both within their broader disciplinary framework and within the parameters established by their institutions. This may not be best practice, however, given the diversity of disciplines and the knowledge that communities have, or do not have, about those disciplines. Morrison and Wagner (2016) argue that the faculty perspective must be taken into account in the CES debate. In

order to 'make sense of the complex list of factors influencing how faculty engage, their reasons for doing it, and how institutions can support them', we need to understand 'how faculty define and make meaning of CES for themselves' (Morrison & Wagner 2016, p. 9). And addressing the issue of potential research partnerships with non-academics, Ward and Miller (2016, p. 189) state, 'How the individual work of both faculty and staff is marginalized, valued, validated, recognized, and rewarded through formal promotion structures and processes remains an area of needed attention within and across institutions of higher education'. Therefore, an argument can be made that a monolithic definition of CES is neither possible nor desirable. Yet, faculty need guidance on how to situate their work.

The California State University (CSU) is the largest four-year public university system in the United States, with 23 campuses. A survey of the CSU's websites on community engagement shows that, at the time of writing, only six campuses specifically define or discuss community-engaged scholarship and emphasise the importance of reciprocity in university-community partnerships. Fourteen other campuses emphasise service-learning as the primary focus of community-engagement work, and a few others also encourage participatory-action research, internships and other forms of research, teaching or service that benefit the community. This range of emphases is expected, and it is likely that more campuses will specifically address CES in the future. However, this also means that individual campuses may place a different

value on various types of work that faculty conduct in the community.

According to one institution's definition, in the context of the broader national conversation, CES 'is centered on a mutually-beneficial collaboration between the university and a community partner outside the academy', contributes to the public good and 'meets the needs of the community partner as defined and expressed by the partner'. Moreover, for university-community partnership work to be considered CES (as opposed to service-learning or participatory-action research, for example), it must either involve a 'strong bidirectional relationship' or be 'community driven', as shown in the last two columns in the chart in Figure 1. This chart is provided on the institution's CES webpage to help explain the campus definition of CES and to guide faculty towards rigorous CES work. The original source is a document created by the US Environmental Protection Agency's National Center for Environmental Research (NCER, 2015), whose goal is to support funding for quality research related to the environment. However, recognising the importance of people within communities and how significant outcomes from community research can only be achieved through the direct involvement of the community, the NCER drafted a primer on community-engaged research (CEnR). This document is directed to academics in general, recognises 'the strengths of the community institutions and individual members' and identifies CEnR along a continuum of engagement between researcher and community partner, as outlined in the chart below. CES, as separate

from service-learning or community-based research, involves only the last two columns.

The above CES definition and its interpretation are helpful guides for scholars to determine what type of work constitutes CES. At the same time, faculty in disciplines which are not well known outside academia, such as linguistics, find themselves ill-positioned to engage in such scholarship for two reasons: (1) the community is unfamiliar with the discipline and its potential contribution to the public good, and is therefore unprepared to engage in true bidirectional collaboration, and (2) the linguist/researcher lacks a network of relationships with communities apart from those with which they conduct their research (e.g. documenting or extensively studying a language). The combination of these two factors leads to a lengthier process for linguists as they pursue CES if their CES work is outside the typical linguist's communities of focus.

Figure 1. Spectrum of community involvement in research

It is important to emphasize that this is neither the fault of the community nor of the field of linguistics. While more linguists today than at any other time are becoming involved in outreach and seeking to work with teachers in K-12 schools, convincing teachers and schools to incorporate linguistics in the curriculum has been slow because of a lack of understanding, curricular constraints, strong adherence to traditional notions of grammar and the nature of adopting curricular changes in general (Reaser 2010). Part of the reason for this, however, is

that, traditionally, linguistics has been a higher education discipline and its broader value to society is not well understood by the general public, and this has been detrimental to both the field and the broader community. Simply put, outside academia linguistics is primarily misunderstood as either the language police or the polyglot society. Usually the first question people ask when they learn someone is a linguist is ‘How many languages do you speak?’, followed or preceded by a comment along the lines of ‘Uh oh, I better watch what I say’. Neither of these is actually true of linguists who generally concern themselves with speakers’ actual knowledge and use of language (though some linguists do speak multiple languages) rather than prescriptive grammatical rules. Linguists have worked in and with communities to document languages or conduct other research, and sometimes this has served the needs of the community. For example, linguists have contributed a great deal to language documentation, whether the linguist sought out a community or vice versa. In the case of the Kawaiisu speakers in Tehachapi, California, it was they who approached linguist Jocelyn Ahlers to assist with the documentation of their language; the community-determined goals and outcomes constitute CES work even under more prescribed definitions (personal communication). The work of linguists also is critical to the conversation about bilingualism and bilingual education, speech and language pathology, text-to-speech and speech-to-text software development, education, law and public health, to name a few of an ever-growing

list of benefits. However, not all of these applications are obviously linked with linguistic study in the public view. Linguistics is not usually discovered by students (myself included) until college. In recent years, recognising these shortcomings, linguistics has made it a priority for linguists to become more active in making the discipline ‘recognizable’ outside academia via public outreach and involvement in K–12 classrooms (Denham & Lobeck 2010; Godley, Reaser & Moore 2015; Linguistics Society of America 2017; Reaser et al. 2017).

As a linguist who teaches prospective teachers, I have come to recognise the role that my current students will have in making language relevant to their students – and the communities to which they belong – beyond their expected understanding that language is used for communication, reading and writing. While the role of linguistics in the K–12 classroom was explored and recognised earlier by a handful of people (Denham & Lobeck 2010; Fillmore & Snow 2000; Honda & O’Neil 1993, 2008; Honda, O’Neil & Pippin 2004; Reaser et al. 2017), recognition has grown over the years, but not yet to a level where it has made a significant impact in our communities. Thus, the general public still does not have a clear understanding of what linguistics is or does. On the other hand, linguists do not have first-hand experience working in K–12 classrooms and therefore are unfamiliar with the needs of students and teachers. As Gelmon, Jordan and Seifer (2013, p. 63) state, ‘in some disciplines and institutions, faculty may not know where to find a “real” community-based organiza-

tion or understand how a collaboration might be beneficial to their scholarship, their students, and their institution’.

Linguists have ideas of how linguistics can contribute to a faculty-community partnership. However, given the interpretation of the CES definition that the partnership be ‘bidirectional’ or ‘community driven’ as it addresses an issue ‘defined and expressed by the partner’, linguists such as myself find themselves in a difficult position. On the one hand, a potential community partner, in this case a school, or a K–12 teacher, does not know that linguistics exists, what it does, or that there are linguists at a university with whom they could collaborate and create new knowledge for the benefit of both partners. In fact, the community may not even know that an issue might exist in the first place. For example, discrimination based on language persists without notice even as other forms of overt discrimination are generally frowned upon. This can take the shape of discrimination based on non-standard dialects of English, languages other than English spoken in the US, or even English spoken as a second language. Looking at language from a scientific perspective can help not only to develop students’ inquiry skills, but also to highlight the fact that all dialects are linguistically equal (Crawford 1995; Reaser et al. 2017). This is an issue of social justice and would potentially translate into less language-based discrimination in the school, family and broader communities with which the students and their families interact. But if the community is not aware of what linguistics does or of an existing issue that

could be addressed, and if the linguist does not have a pre-existing partnership that may have been established for some purpose other than CES, then the process towards CES will take that much longer – longer, I would argue, than for someone in a discipline that is at least somewhat better understood outside academia. Furthermore, the impact of the work in the larger community, outside of the school, for example, may not be visible until much later, as the students become agents of change within their families and other communities. In turn, the characteristics of these communities – extended families or neighbourhoods – will also direct the impact of the work. It will take a lot longer to create change both with and by students whose families support the ‘English-only movement’, for example.

If CES is defined in such a way that it is restricted to a collaboration instigated by the community partner to address a need experienced by that community, the linguist cannot approach a community partner with an idea for a project or an issue that could be addressed via the partnership. As I suggest in the later section on lessons learned, in order to achieve a truly bidirectional collaboration the scholar must first engage in various activities (e.g. volunteering, community outreach) that will nurture trust and inform the partner of the objectives and societal benefits of the discipline, and must in turn be informed by the partner and their needs. While this may appear true for any discipline, the crucial point here is that more familiar disciplines (e.g. art, STEM, or health-related) will not face as long a process. In the next section I reflect

further upon my own experience and offer suggestions for how linguists, and others from similarly challenged disciplines, can develop community partnerships that will lead to community-engaged scholarship.

Reflections of a linguist's journey towards a CES partnership

Since beginning to work with undergraduates who are prospective K-8 teachers a decade ago, I have been contemplating the role of linguistics in the school curriculum. Having graduated from a highly theoretical linguistics department, where we were all majoring in linguistics and then working on our doctorate degrees, I had taken it for granted that interest in linguistics was just there in the classroom. Everyone was taking linguistics because they loved the subject for its own sake. However, faced with students who were taking linguistics classes not because they liked linguistics, but because they were required to take these classes, I found myself answering a lot of questions about the reasons we were studying language from a scientific perspective. While some students loved the subject, others struggled to understand its purpose. It was not difficult to demonstrate how certain aspects would be beneficial to them in their future profession as teachers. For example, learning about dialects, linguistic diversity and bilingualism were topics that most students immediately identified with and could see how they would be relevant. To some extent, learning about phonetics and phonology, the sound system of language, was also accepted as playing a role in how they could help their students to read and

write, and understand their students' phonetic spelling in the early grades. What was more difficult was keeping that interest when doing serious linguistic analysis, which can be tedious and challenging, and getting students to think of ways they could use linguistics when they became teachers. I further realised that I, too, had a limited understanding of how it might be relevant, and that without working in the K-8 classroom with teachers and students, I would continue to be limited in my understanding.

The idea of working with teachers in the classroom is not a new one. As mentioned in the previous section, Honda, O'Neil, Pippin, Denham and Lobeck have been involved in such work for some time on small projects that started either in their children's classrooms or with teachers they already knew and who were comfortable with them. However, while this work constituted engaged scholarship, it was not necessarily community-engaged scholarship. This work was intended to introduce students to linguistics and was also a way to test the hypotheses entertained by linguists about the role that linguistics played in the primary and secondary grades, such as developing scientific thinking skills (Denham & Lobeck 2010; Honda & O'Neil 2008). The bidirectional and reciprocal components of the partnership were not obvious.

In Spring 2015, I had not yet encountered the field of CES, but I wanted to begin working in a classroom. I approached my daughter's former fourth grade teacher and suggested some ways in which we could talk about language and linguistics and how this could address

some of the recent common core curriculum standards, such as developing scientific writing, under the college and career readiness standards, or developing foundational skills of word analysis (e.g. working with Latin and Greek roots). The teacher was very open to the idea and graciously offered class time for me to volunteer once a week during the semester. The lessons were primarily identified by me and approved by the teacher. The students enjoyed all the activities that we conducted (e.g. figuring out parts of speech from Lewis Carol's *Jabberwocky*, or Greek and Latin roots from Harry Potter's spells); however, we did not create new knowledge, as necessitated by scholarship. I did not know how to properly articulate the goals of this work within the context of CES because I was not familiar with CES. I was focused on how linguistics could be used in the classroom in a way that would engage students, and what I could learn from the experience so that I could bring that to my own classroom for future teachers at the university. This had the potential to be CES, but it was not, and I really did not know how to do it. No research had been conducted, only practice of linguistics with fourth graders, and observation of what that might mean for my own prospective teacher students.

During the same semester, my institution announced that there would be a year-long faculty learning community (FLC) focused on community-engaged scholarship, and the brief description in the announcement seemed to be exactly what I needed for the work I wanted to do. I applied to participate in the FLC, and

joined the FLC the following year. The FLC had three other faculty members from different disciplines and two facilitators. I naively believed that, based on my experience with the fourth grade, I would be ready to engage in CES a year from then, and I saw the FLC as a supportive environment for that type of work. The plan was to develop a new partnership (for practical reasons I wanted to work with a school that was close to my university) and begin the work as soon as possible. As we began discussing CES and what it entailed, I realised that I had not understood it properly. In particular, the requirement that there be a 'bidirectional' or 'community driven' partnership involved in identifying the issue to be addressed became an almost insurmountable challenge. Approaching a teacher at a new school with an idea about a partnership in a field that was not well understood by the community, and expecting the teacher to recognise a potential need that the partnership could address, seemed impossible. Also, the school I wanted to partner with was a new school that my children were attending. As such, I had the slight, but marginal, advantage of being an 'insider'. The teachers knew me as a new parent, but we had no history and no relationship. Nevertheless, this was helpful as I did not approach teachers as a complete 'outsider' (Post et al. 2016).

After a few attempts at connecting with teachers, which included offers by me to volunteer and collaborate on any language-related projects they might identify, I successfully connected with the teacher with whom I am currently working. This was a longer process than I had

anticipated, spanning the academic year, which may have been attributable to a number of factors. First, the teachers may have been overwhelmed by the amount of work they had to accomplish during the year, and adding one more thing to the schedule had seemed prohibitive. Second, and I would argue more likely, the relevance of linguistics and what a potential partnership could accomplish was not obvious to the teachers. Third, and also probably equally significant, my in-between position as an insider-outsider at the beginning of the year shifted closer to 'insider' towards the end of the year, thus providing an advantage (Dwyer & Buckle 2009). Still, despite this advantage, it took more than two years to begin the CES work.

When I met with the teacher, an 8th grade humanities instructor, I was forthcoming from the beginning about the goals of a potential partnership and shared with her a tremendously helpful tool, a matrix for planning and implementing a CES project (Figure 2), adapted by my university from the original work of Jeffrey Howard at the Ginsberg Center, University of Michigan (2007). The matrix outlines the purposes of a partnership and emphasises the role of the community partner.

Figure 2 Matrix for planning and implementing a CES project

I knew by the time we met, which was at the end of one year of effort and learning about CES, that community organisations are often tired of being approached by university faculty who want to conduct their research there (the 'para-

chute' approach), so I wanted to make it clear from the beginning that this was not that type of work. The teacher was excited to see that the goals were truly paying attention to the needs of the school, and even though we did not have a clear idea of how the project would work, we decided to give it a try the following year and see what happened. We discussed some possible things that we could do, and the teacher identified the need for her students to improve their fundamental knowledge of how English works so they could become better writers. That was a good start and the beginning of a developing relationship.

Over the course of the following school year we co-taught a group of 8th grade students once a week, each time responding to the needs of the students as identified by the teacher and the students. We worked on grammatical structure, Latin and Greek roots, and non-standard dialects of English. By the end of the year, we had an engaged partnership and we had built trust. We understood what each of us could bring to the partnership and how the students could benefit from our collaboration. So by the end of the first year of collaborative work we were poised to engage in CES the following year.

The school is designed around project-based learning, a teaching methodology which is student-centred and via which students acquire skills and knowledge by engaging in long-term inquiry around a particular problem or real-world question (Blumenfeld et al. 2005; Dewey 1959). While the actual work is outside the scope of this article, we are

currently exploring ways to incorporate linguistics into the students' projects, rather than have it as a peripheral subject of interest, with the goal of both strengthening their writing skills and making them more aware of linguistic diversity so they are more informed citizens and users of language. We have designed specific instruments to evaluate whether and how students achieve these goals, hence our work now includes scholarship and the creation of new knowledge, which will benefit both the community and the university.

What should be clear from this reflection is that advancing to the starting line for conducting CES in a field such as linguistics is a very long process. In my case, it took over two years. Some disciplines may have a shorter path because they are better understood by the community. For example, STEM disciplines, because of their prominence in the media and in the school curriculum, may find it easier to engage in this type of work. Likewise, the health professions, where this work began, are also better understood and the benefits to the community are more immediately obvious. Even within the field of linguistics there are subdisciplines which are easier or more difficult for the public to access. For example, sociolinguistics and language acquisition are much more accessible, while the formal study of phonetics and phonology (sound systems) or syntax (language structure) is less accessible. Linguists from these subfields, such as myself, must find ways to connect their work to the broader interests of the community and be committed to a long-term partnership so that even-

tually the more abstract aspects of linguistic study can become accessible and meaningful. For example, it would be difficult to form a partnership with a school on the grounds of studying the sounds of language without connecting it to the role that sounds play in learning foreign languages, or how non-native accents can be explained and why some accents are viewed as more desirable or less desirable than others. Some linguists have forged pathways within the public health field, focusing on issues of public health literacy, and have successfully contributed to the public good by offering practical solutions to creating more accessible health information that is also linguistically and culturally informed (Ellis, Connor & Marshall 2014; Parmer et al. 2015; Zarcadoolas 2005).

This does not mean that the work for these more easily recognised disciplines is any less demanding – researchers still have to develop trusting relationships with community partners, and this is time-consuming. What it does mean, however, is that linguistics, in general, and potentially other social sciences and humanities have an additional obstacle to overcome, which is the fact that the community does not know that they exist.

To sum up, there are two reasons why CES is difficult for linguists: (1) the definition of CES and its interpretation, which may discourage participation in CES in the first place, and (2) a lack of understanding of linguistics outside academia. In the next section I offer suggestions for how this type of work can be conducted more effectively by inviting linguists to contribute to the creation of policies clari-

fying community-engaged scholarship expectations for tenure and promotion at their institutions and beyond, and to engage in a number of activities that will improve understanding of linguistics outside academia in order to eventually break this cycle.

Lessons learned and potential solutions

I learned two things from this two-year process. First, as new modes of research develop, we have to be careful with how we define them and how those definitions are interpreted, both at the individual and the institutional level. Second, linguistics as a field needs to do a better job of making the discipline a household name. Students should not have to wait till college to hear about linguistics.

Regarding the first point, current definitions and interpretations of CES mean that CES will require additional time for some disciplines. As I have shown, it can take years to even begin to conduct research that may subsequently become published material, which is what promotion and tenure committees expect to see (Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer 2013). Because not all disciplines have the same standing in the community, they cannot all begin CES work in the same way or within the same timeframe. This has significant implications for the tenure and promotion process and may discourage scholars from participating in CES altogether, forcing them to focus instead on projects they can quickly turn into publications, but which may not be as meaningful. Most universities do not offer the support needed by faculty to engage in this type of

work, yet they expect this type of work to be conducted. A possible solution to this is for scholars to advocate for the development of promotion and tenure policies that recognise the lengthy preliminary work done by the scholar with the community partner as an explicitly essential and valid part of a faculty member's scholarship productivity, even though that work may not be published or publishable in traditional venues. The Community-Campus Partnership for Health website provides a toolkit for scholars (<https://ccph.memberclicks.net/ces-toolkit>) to help them prepare tenure and promotion portfolios highlighting their work in the community, and these scholars should be able to use the work entailed in building a community-scholar partnership that precedes actual CES work as scholarship, rather than service.

With respect to the second point, the field of linguistics has already recognised the need to make linguistics better understood. If this were achieved, and people in the community understood 'linguistics' the way they understand 'mathematics' (mathematics itself has its own issues with being misunderstood by the public, yet it is still better understood than linguistics), then the journey for a linguist wanting to engage in CES might be somewhat shortened. Some things are already being done to make this a reality, but the efforts are scattered across the country and conducted unsystematically by people like myself who are interested in this type of work. The Linguistics Society of America encourages public outreach, including participation in STEM events where community members can see lan-

guage as a science, and has a committee on Language in the School Curriculum charged with exploring and pursuing 'ways in which the linguistics community can have an effect on school instruction in language-related topics, including linguistics' (Linguistics Society of America website). Current efforts include exploring more ways to incorporate linguistics in schools and encouraging more university faculty to partner with teachers, particularly at the high-school level, to introduce linguistics to students. In addition, linguists can follow the models of Connor, Rubin and Zarcadoolas, who have successfully merged their linguistics interests and professional training with public health (Ellis, Connor & Marshall 2014; Parmer et al. 2015; Zarcadoolas, Pleasant & Greer 2005). To these efforts I would add volunteerism, collaboration between linguists and faculty members in other disciplines to seek convergent goals and possible partnerships (Anderson 2017) and working with university students who are studying to be teachers (see also Denham & Lobeck 2010 and Fillmore & Snow 2000).

Based on my experience, a linguist-teacher partnership requires a lot of volunteer time; therefore, linguists interested in pursuing this type of work should consider carefully their reasons for doing so (short-term product, long-term impact and product), the time they have to devote to it, and the level of departmental and institutional support. It is also critical that, in pursuing such a partnership, the linguist respond to the teacher's and their students' needs, which may require classroom observation, becoming familiar with

state standards, and having open discussions about the needs identified by the teacher and how linguistics can provide inquiry-based creative ways of addressing those needs. Because volunteering may not always be recognised as an academic pursuit, when discussing this work for the purpose of tenure or promotion, faculty members should highlight the contribution of the collaboration to the community and to their own professional development, as I have done here: it is a pathway towards CES and the work itself has academic value. Furthermore, as more faculty members become involved in community-engaged work (whether service-learning or CES), linguists should seek out collaboration with faculty in other disciplines with whom they may share similar perspectives on CES (Morrison & Wagner 2016).

While it is unrealistic and impractical to have a linguist conducting CES in every K-12 classroom, linguists who work with future teachers at the undergraduate level have the opportunity to make this type of work relevant and to prepare their students to become teachers who will use linguistics in their classrooms for all its individual and societal benefits. Linguists need to develop partnerships with teachers so that they can tailor college-level linguistics curricula accordingly. One can envision an undergraduate course where prospective teachers regularly engage with students in schools with which the instructors (linguists) have established partnerships and actually conduct research. The prospective teachers might discuss the role of linguistics in education with each other and with their instructor,

meet with the public school teachers, and together establish some research topic of interest to both (e.g. how can students learn what sentence fragments are, and how can they edit their own writing for fragments?). The prospective teachers might subsequently (1) discuss linguistically informed approaches to understanding fragments, such as inquiry-based exercises that illustrate what fragments are and how they are not always 'bad' as is typically taught (they are actually desirable in spoken language); (2) hypothesise what types of activities would lead students to recognise and edit fragments in their own writing; and (3) conduct research in the classroom to evaluate whether those methods were successful and whether students understood that there is a difference between spoken and written language. This discussion could be extended further to differences in registers and dialects, and has the potential to positively contribute to the public good.

Linguists who do not work specifically with future teachers would benefit from highlighting this type of work in their classes as well. Most undergraduates in linguistics do not go on to become researchers, but rather become technical writers, lawyers, speech and language pathologists, or foreign language teachers. K-12 education is a profession they should consider, and it might be one they would consider if the connections between linguistics and education were made evident. Researchers and teachers in fields that are in a similar situation to linguistics would benefit from the same suggestions offered above. Whatever the

field, finding service opportunities in order to develop relationships with community partners can lead to the development of a CES project. One can even envision a service-to-CES pathway where faculty and students engage in service-learning opportunities, building trusting partnerships between the university and the community partner, which then leads to CES (Vogel & Seifer 2011). Service-learning can be used towards this goal, as in the case of prospective teachers working with linguistically and culturally diverse students as they themselves build sociolinguistic knowledge and language skills that they can use in their future classrooms (Fan 2013). Subsequently, this work can lead to CES for students and linguists alike.

Designing a university curriculum that emphasises the role of the discipline to the broader community will create citizens who take that knowledge into the community. As scholars in these fields, we need to adopt a long-term perspective and expect future generations to have a better understanding of these lesser known fields than has the current generation.

Conclusions

Community-engaged scholarship is encouraged by universities and funding agencies as it offers opportunities for conducting meaningful work with community partners for the mutual benefit of the community and the researcher. As such, CES is both a challenging and a rewarding avenue for research, as well as a high-stakes item in the review process for tenure and promotion. These two factors, the topic of this article, have different im-

plications given the current conversation in the CES field. As a relatively new concept that incorporates scholarship in community-engaged work, CES is still being redefined, even at the individual university level. Current definitions and their interpretations can be too restrictive for disciplines that are not well understood outside academia, such as linguistics, thereby creating unanticipated challenges. While CES requires a significant investment of time for any faculty dedicated to cultivating trust-based community relationships – a prerequisite for CES work – faculty in these disciplines have to spend much more time not only cultivating the partnership, but also making the discipline and its benefits understandable to the partner without resorting to a top-down approach to research (where the academic imposes the research on the partner). This is necessary in order for both partner and researcher to arrive at a mutually beneficial project, which is a fundamental expectation of CES. A more prescribed definition, set at institutional

level, can have the unintentional effect of limiting understanding of what CES can be, and in effect discourage the pursuit of CES by some disciplines.

Based on my personal experience with the process of engaging in CES as a linguist, I have offered suggestions for linguists and academics in similar disciplines on how to begin such work and how to advocate for such work to be recognised for tenure and promotion purposes. The faculty member can seek out service opportunities in the community to learn about the potential partner's needs and inform them about their discipline as part of the partnership negotiation process. Further, they can suggest and advocate for the creation of university policies that take the lengthy and complex preliminary work of CES into account as part of the faculty member's scholarly work for the tenure and promotion process, and they can also participate in activities that will make their discipline more accessible to the public, thereby shortening the process in the long term.

References

- Akkari, A & Loomis, C 1998, 'Toward a new understanding of language minority students' experiences of bilingual education in the United States', *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée*, vol. 64, pp. 31–59.
- Akkari, A & Loomis, C 2012, 'Introduction – Opening educational systems to cultural diversity: International and comparative perspectives', *Prospects*, UNESCO International Bureau of Education, vol. 42, no. 2: pp. 137–45. doi: 10.1007/s11125-012-9234-x
- Andersen, L 2017, "Useful, usable and used": Sustaining an Australian model of cross-faculty service learning by concentrating on shared value creation', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 10, pp. 58–77. doi: 10.5130/ijcre.v10ia.5574
- Barker, D 2004, 'The scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of five emerging practices', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 9, no. 2: pp. 123–37.
- Battistich, V, Solomon, D, Kim, D, Watson, M & Schaps, E 1995, 'Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and perfor-

mance: A multilevel analysis', *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 32, no. 3: pp. 627–58. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003627>

Baugh, J 2005, 'Linguistic profiling', in A Ball, S Makoni, G Smitherman & A Spears (eds), *Black linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*, Routledge, New York, pp. 155–68.

Bloomfield, L 1933, *Language*, Henry Holt, New York.

Blumenfeld, P, Modell, J, Bartko, W, Fredericks, J, Friedel, J & Paris A 2005, 'School engagement of inner city students during middle childhood', in C Cooper, C Garcia Coll, W Bartko, H Davis & C Chatman (eds), *Developmental pathways through middle childhood: Rethinking diversity and contexts as resources*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 145–70.

Boyer, E 1996, 'The scholarship of engagement', *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, vol. 1, no. 1: p. 11.

Brown, A 1997, 'Transforming schools into communities of thinking and learning about serious matters', *American Psychologist*, vol. 52, no. 4: pp. 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.52.4.399>

Calleson, D, Jordan, C & Seifer, S 2005, 'Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise?', *Academic Medicine*, vol. 80, no. 4: p. 317. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200504000-00002>

Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions 2005, *Linking scholarship and communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Seattle*,

WA. <https://ccph.memberclicks.net/assets/Documents/FocusAreas/linkingscholarship.pdf>

Crawford, J 1995, *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (3rd edn), Bilingual Educational Services, Inc, Los Angeles, CA.

Denham, K & Lobeck, A 2010, *Linguistics at school: Language awareness in primary and secondary education*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York.

Dewey, J, 1959, 'My pedagogic creed', in J Dewey (ed.), *Dewey on education*, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, pp. 19–32.

Dunham, HW 1986, 'The community today: Place or process?', *Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 14, iss. 4, doi: 10.1002/1520-6629(198610)14:4<399::AID-JCOP2290140408>3.0.CO;2-U

Dwyer, S & Buckle, J 2009, 'The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 8, no. 1: pp. 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105>

Ellis, R, Connor, U & Marshall, J 2014, 'Development of patient-centric linguistically tailored psychoeducational messages to support nutrition and medication self-management in type 2 diabetes: A feasibility study', *Patient Preference and Adherence*, vol. 8, pp. 1399–1408. <https://doi.org/10.2147/ppa.s69291>

Fan, Y 2013, 'Every teacher is a language teacher: Preparing teacher candidates for English language learners through service-learning', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 6, pp. 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v6i1.3232>

Fillmore, L & Snow, C 2000, 'What teachers need to know about language', Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

Fitzgerald, H, Bruns, K, Sonka, S, Furco, A & Swanson, L 2016, 'The centrality of engagement in higher education', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 20, no. 1: pp. 223–43.

Furco, A 2010, 'The engaged campus: Toward a comprehensive approach to public engagement', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 58, no. 4: p. 375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2010.527656>

Gelmon, S, Blanchard, L, Ryan, K & Seifer, S 2012, 'Building capacity for community-engaged scholarship: Evaluation of the faculty development component of the faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 16, no. 1: p. 21.

Gelmon, S, Jordan, C & Seifer, S 2013, 'Community-engaged scholarship in the academy: An action agenda', *Change*, July/August, p. 58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2013.806202>

Godley, A, Reaser, J & Moore, K 2015, 'Pre-service English language arts teachers' development of critical language awareness for teaching', *Linguistics and Education*, vol. 32, p. 41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.03.015>

Gumperz, J 1971, *Language in social groups*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Honda, M & O'Neil, W 1993, 'Triggering science-forming capacity through linguistic inquiry', in K Hale & S Keyser (eds), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 229–55.

Honda, M & O'Neil, W 2008, *Thinking linguistically*, Blackwell, Malden, MA and Oxford, UK.

Honda, M, O'Neil, W & Pippin, D 2004, 'When Jell-O meets generative grammar: Linguistics in the fifth-grade English classroom', paper presented at the Linguistics Society of America's Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, 10 January.

Howard, J 2007, Ginsberg Center, University of Michigan, viewed 12 June 2017. <https://ginsberg.umich.edu/topic/community-engaged-scholarship>

Janke, E & Colbeck, C 2008, 'An exploration of the influence of public scholarship on faculty work', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 21, no. 1: pp. 31–46.

Labov, W 1972, *Sociolinguistic patterns*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Linguistics Society of America, 'Language in the School Curriculum Committee', viewed 12 June 2017, www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/school-curriculum

Maurana, C, Wolff, M, Beck, B & Simpson, D 2001, 'Working with our communities: Moving from service to scholarship in the health professions', *Education for Health*, vol. 14, no. 2: pp. 207–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280110064312>

Morrison, E & Wagner, W 2016, 'Exploring faculty perspectives on community engaged scholarship: The case for Q Methodology', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 23, no. 1: pp. 5–14.

National Center for Environmental Research 2015, *NCER Community-Engaged Research Primer*, viewed 12 June 2017, www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/cenr.pdf

O'Meara, K & Niehaus, E 2009, 'Service-learning is ... How faculty explain their practice', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 16, no. 1: pp. 17–32.

Parmer, J, Furtado, S, Rubin, D, Freimuth, V, Kaley, T & Okundaye, M 2015, 'Improving interactive health literacy skills of older adults: Lessons learned from formative organizational research with community partners', *Progress in Community Health Partnerships*, vol. 9, no. 4: pp. 531–36. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2015.0071>

Post, M, Ward, E, Longo, N & Saltmarsh, J 2016, *Publicly engaged scholars: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education*, Stylus Publishing, Sterling, VA.

Reaser, J 2010, 'Developing sociolinguistic curricula that help teachers meet standards', in K Denham & A Lobeck (eds), *Linguistics at school: Language awareness in primary and secondary education*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Reaser, J, Adger, C, Wolfram, W & Christian, D 2017, *Dialects at school: Educating linguistically diverse students*, Routledge, London.

Sandmann, L 2008, 'Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996–2006', *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 12, no. 1: pp. 91–104.

Vogel, A & Seifer, S 2011, 'Impacts of sustained institutional participation in service-learning: Perspectives from faculty, staff and administrators', *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 4, pp. 186–202. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v4i0.1789>

Wade, A & Demb, A 2009, 'A conceptual model to explore faculty community engagement', *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, vol. 15, no. 2: pp. 5–16.

Wade, A & Demb, A 2012, 'Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach and engagement', *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 83, no. 3: pp. 337–66. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0019>

Ward, E & Miller, A 2016, 'Next-generation engaged scholars: Stewards of change', in M Post, E Ward, N Longo & J Saltmarsh (eds), *Publicly engaged scholars: Next-generation engagement and the future of higher education*, Stylus Publishing, Sterling, VA.

Zarcadoolas, C, Pleasant, A & Greer, D 2005, 'Understanding health literacy: An expanded model', *Health Promotion International*, vol. 20, no. 2: pp. 195–203. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dah609>

Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters, Dept.

II of Philosophy, History, and Sociology; v. 7/8-11/12

by: Polish Academy of Sciences; v. 13-22

by: University of Warsaw, Institute of Papyrology and Ancient Law;

v. 23- by: University of Warsaw, Institute of Archaeology, Department of Papyrology;

v.31- with The Raphael Taubenschlag Foundation;

v. 35- with University of Warsaw, Faculty of Law and Administration.

RSS

ORDER ENQUIRIES: Tel: +44 (0)1226 734350 Fax: +44 (0)1226 734438
Oxbow Books, 47 Church St., Barnsley, S70 2AS
GENERAL ENQUIRIES: Tel: +44 (0)1865 241249 Fax: +44 (0)1865 794449
Oxbow Books, The Old Music Hall, 106-108 Cowley Road, OX4 1JE
© 2012 Oxbow Books. All Rights Reserved.

